00141898

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 28 March, 2016

LIVES

OF THE

QUEENS OF SCOTLAND,

&c.

BY

AGNES STRICKLAND.

Queen Mary presents the infant Prince to Darnley.

VOL. IV.

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD & SONS,
EDINBURGH & LONDON.

LIVES

OF THE

QUEENS OF SCOTLAND

AND

ENGLISH PRINCESSES

CONNECTED WITH THE REGAL SUCCESSION OF GREAT BRITAIN

BY

Agnes Strickland

AUTHOR OF

"LIVES OF THE QUEENS OF ENGLAND"

1118 98 d

"The treasures of antiquity laid up
In old historic rolls I opened."—BEAUMONT.

VOL. IV.

TTA.e.1

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD AND SONS
EDINBURGH AND LONDON
MDCCCLIII

Str / Liv
141898

ILLUSTRATIONS

TO

THE FOURTH VOLUME.

FRONTISPIECE—PORTRAIT OF MARY STUART. From the Original Painting presented by herself to SIR HENRY CURWEN of Workinton Hall, Cumberland; engraved for the first time, in illustration of this Work, by the kind permission of HENRY CURWEN, ESQ. of Workinton Hall, the present possessor.

VIGNETTE—MARY STUART PRESENTING THEIR NEWBORN SON, JAMES PRINCE OF SCOTLAND, AND HEIR OF GREAT BRITAIN, TO HER HUSBAND, HENRY LORD DARNLEY, TITULAR KING OF SCOTLAND. (*See Page* 342.)

THE

QUEENS OF SCOTLAND

MARY STUART

CHAPTER XIII.

SUMMARY

Difficulties of Mary Stuart's position—Treachery of her ministers and council—Commencement of intrigues to marry her to Lord Robert Dudley—Mary returns to Edinburgh—She completes her twenty-first year—Her birthday commemoration—She takes cold in the Chapel-royal—Her illness—Imputed to excessive dancing—She is forced to keep her bed—Randolph brings her a ring from Queen Elizabeth—Indisposition prevents her from seeing him—He sends the ring by the Countess of Argyll—Mary's demonstrations of pleasure—Receives Randolph by her bed-side—Their conversation—Her bodily weakness and mysterious melancholy—Distressing events in her household—Origin of the ballad of Mary Hamilton—Increased illness of the Queen—Her life despaired of—John Knox cited before the Privy Council—The sick Queen compelled to preside—Agitating discussion—His triumph—Queen's continued illness—Councils held in her bed-chamber—She gives audience to Randolph—Queen Elizabeth's objections to her marriage with the Archduke Charles—Wishes her to take an English subject—Declines naming the person—Mary restored to health—Twelfth-Night pastimes in Holyrood—The Queen of the Bean—Amiable trait of Queen Mary—Randolph in love with Mary Beton—Queen Mary dances with Randolph—Their conversation—Queen's household allowance of coals, candles, wax, wine, and bread—Her diet—That of her ladies—Salaries of her ladies and officers of state paid from her French jointure rents—Her economy.

THE difficulties with which Mary Stuart had to contend, in her youth and inexperience, when she returned as a widow of eighteen from the polished and admiring court of France, to assume the reins of empire in a realm impoverished by foreign invasions and convulsed with the

maddening strife of warring creeds and parties, have been generally acknowledged. Their extent can only be comprehended by those who have had leisure and opportunity to penetrate deeply into the black mysteries of the Scotch correspondence preserved in the State Paper Office. The fact that neither M. Mignet nor M. Dargaud, the recent French biographers of Mary Stuart, have examined that mass of diplomatic wickedness, may well account for the hasty conclusions formed by the one, and the perplexities confessed by the other, in regard to her real conduct and character. A solution to all that appears enigmatical and inconsistent in her, may be found in the tangible proofs of the guilty confederacy between the members of her Cabinet and the English Sovereign. Traced as these documents are, in a fading fluid, on the most fragile of substances, they have survived the massive walls of London and Edinburgh, and outlasted many of the stately palaces and strong castles from whence they are dated. Is this a mere coincidence, the effect of blind chance?—or has the angel of truth kept guard over these incontrovertible evidences of the avarice, the subtlety, the treachery of the accusers of their royal mistress, in order that a correct judgment might be formed of the credibility of the charges they have brought against her, and the motives by which they were actuated in bringing them? Not the least of the systematic derelictions of these men from their duty to their Queen and country, was their complicity with Elizabeth's attempt to cajole Mary into a marriage with Lord Robert Dudley, the younger son of new nobility, twice infamed by the block in his descent, and stigmatised in his own person by the suspicion of wife-murder. The memorable intrigue for beguiling Mary into this unworthy alliance commenced in the summer of 1563, when Randolph visited his own court to concert with Elizabeth the preliminary moves in the game.[1] That the project was early communicated to Knox is apparent from the following mysterious passage in his letter to Cecil, dated October 6, 1563: "If the man most inward with you, and dear unto me for those graces God hath bestowed upon

[1] State Paper Office MSS., Scotland.

him, be such as both our hearts wish him to be, then will the few that yet remain uncorrupted strive for the mastery against the force of the blinded multitude; but an if he follow the contrary faction, be it directly or indirectly, then assure yourself that the rage of that storm shall overthrow the force of the strongest."[1] In the same letter Knox plainly indicates his animosity to Mary, by observing "that she is born to be the plague of the realm;"[2] reiterates advice given in a previous communication to the English minister, about *furnishing* the north Border; and adds the patriotic information "that the Inch between Leith and Kinghorn is left void," meaning in a defenceless state: rather a perilous contingency, considering that Edinburgh had been sacked and fired by the English twice within the last twenty years.

Early in December, Mary returned to Holyrood for despatch of business and her birthday celebration. It was the anniversary on which she completed her twenty-first year. The commemoration was made, as usual on her name day, one of the great festivals in honour of the Virgin Mary: the morning was devoted to a religious service, and the evening to a grand ball. Both were apparently attended with bad effects to the Queen, for she took a severe cold in consequence of being over-long at her prayers in the damp Chapel-royal, and did not improve her feverish symptoms by the fatigue of dancing over-much at her ball in the evening.

Randolph, the English ambassador, writes to Cecil on the 13th of December, that when he arrived in Edinburgh, he understood the Queen kept her bed, and that her illness was attributed to her exertions in dancing on the above occasion; but that he was inclined to think with her, that she had taken cold in the chapel with the length of the service.[3] The real cause of her illness was probably her return to Edinburgh—a climate almost as inimical to her as it had proved to Magdalene of France.

[1] State Paper Office MSS., Scotland. Holograph.
[2] State Paper MS. Knox to Cecil, Oct. 6, 1563.
[3] Randolph to Cecil. State Paper Office MS., inedited.

It was not, however, for Mary Stuart, as a Queen-regnant, burdened with the cares of state, to indulge at any time in the repose and privacy requisite for the comfort of an invalid. When too ill to rise, she had to receive her ministers by her bedside, and to give audience to the ambassadors of foreign Sovereigns, in like manner, if they had private messages to deliver, or letters to present which required personal replies. Cabinet councils were also held in her chamber, when she was unable to leave it. Her French education rendered these things less irksome to Mary than might otherwise have been the case. It was the custom of the times; all things were conducted with the solemnity of royal etiquette; and the deportment of the youthful widow, on these occasions, savoured not of the coquettish levity which startled the grave peers and privy-councillors of England at the bedchamber levées of the maiden Queen of that realm, where the favoured Dudley was wont to usurp the privilege of her mistress of the robes, by assisting at her toilette.[1]

Queen Mary understanding that Randolph had returned to Edinburgh, charged with private letters and the gift of a fair diamond from Queen Elizabeth, and was desirous of delivering his credentials, consented to receive him in her sick-chamber. Randolph came at the appointed hour, but after waiting some time in the anteroom, the Earl of Moray was sent to him by the royal invalid, with an apologetic message, praying him to excuse her till the morrow, as she found herself not in a state to see him or any one that day. Then, lest the representative of her captious sister of England might fancy that he had not been treated with sufficient respect, Queen Mary sent the Countess of Argyll after Moray to repeat her apologies, and to make due inquiries, in her name, after the health of the Queen his mistress.[2]

"I reported in what case I left her Majesty," writes Randolph, "with some other words of good-will towards her Grace (Queen Mary); and withal required the ladie of Argyll

[1] Despatches of La Mothe Fénélon, edited by Purton Cooper, Esq.
[2] Randolph to Cecil, Dec. 13, 1563. State Paper MS., inedited.

to present my Sovereign's token, saying, 'I would reserve her Majesty's letters until I might conveniently, at her Grace's leave, have access unto her.' I tarried the answer hereof, and understand that the jewel was marvellously esteemed, oftentime looked upon, and many times kissed. So was I for that day dismissed, and willed the next day, being Sunday, to be there again. Sunday,"[1] pursues his excellency, "I dined with my lord of Moray, and immediately after was sent for to the Queen. I found her Grace lying in her bed. After divers purposes of the Queen's Majesty, her court, nobility, and other, I delivered first the best-written letter, which, after her Grace had read, she gave unto me again, and willed me to read it for the credit my Sovereign had put me in. I delivered her Grace also the second letter, which she read, and entereth straight in *purpose* (discourse) with me of her uncles, and their good-will towards my Sovereign. I heard her with good-will, but replied not much.[2] I believed no more (be it spoken under correction) than before I did. The occasion of that talk was, that the Queen's Majesty had given her thanks for the Cardinal's friendship towards Sir Nicholas Throckmorton"[3] —namely, for procuring his liberation, through Mary's intercession, after he had been arrested and thrown into prison by the French government, when detected in violating the duties of an ambassador, by his intrigues with the disaffected Huguenot chiefs. Little had Throckmorton deserved that favour at the hands of the young Sovereign of Scotland, and basely did he requite her for her magnanimity. Both parties acted according to their respective dispositions: Mary in returning good for evil, and Throckmorton in requiting her benevolence with fresh injuries.

The fair invalid, in order to mark her respect for the royal donor, wore the diamond Queen Elizabeth had sent her during her interview with Randolph. "She showeth me the ring upon her finger," continues he: "it lacketh no praises of her part; but I commended more the mind of the sender than the present itself. Few were then in the

[1] Randolph to Cecil, Dec. 13, 1563. State Paper MS., inedited.
[2] Ibid. [3] Ibid.

chamber that spake not their opinions as well of the giver as the thing itself. 'Well,' saith she, 'two jewels I have that must die with me, and willingly shall never out of my sight;' and showeth me a ring which she saith 'was the King's, her husband.' In like purposes much time was spent. I perceived, at last, that her Grace was not well, and desired that I might no further trouble her for that time. She gave me thanks, and desired me to return after supper, which I did; and after few words unto her Grace, perceiving that she was not well, I offered to retire myself, without further declaration of anything that I had to say of my instructions. 'You do well,' saith she, 'for that you find me not well at ease.'" Randolph then withdrew, with the intention, as he tells his colleague, of sparing her for two or three days.

Although Mary had exerted herself to converse with her usual graceful courtesy, and, previous to this attack of illness, had hunted, danced, and gone through the daily routine of business and recreation, it had been weariness and vexation of spirit to her, for all her sprightliness was forced and unreal. Small cause, indeed, had she for gaiety at any time, under the circumstances in which she was placed; and it is apparent that she was subject to constitutional fits of dejection, a fatal legacy from her broken-hearted sire.

"Intending," as he informs Cecil, "to spare her for two or three days, the ambassador took his leave."[1] Never, perhaps, had any creature greater need of consideration than the poor young Queen, who, while exerting herself on a sick-bed to receive diplomatic visits, converse with grace, and reciprocate formal compliments of state with all the punctilious demonstrations of respect proper on such occasions, was suffering under a depression of spirits, of which Randolph gives the following touching picture: "For the space of two months this Queen hath been divers times in great melancholies. Her grief is marvellous secret. Many times she weepeth when there is little appearance of occasion."[2] Alas for Mary! Were not the recollections

[1] Randolph to Cecil, Dec. 13, 1563. State Paper MS., ined. [2] Ibid.

connected with the Gordon tragedy enough to cause those tears, and that mysterious sadness which perplexed the hard, worldly-minded spies by whom she was surrounded? Randolph evidently suspected that the vexations and troubles excited by Queen Elizabeth had been the source of Mary's dejection, for he adds, "I trust now she will take some comfort of the Queen my Sovereign's dealings towards her." He concludes his long and interesting letter with these particulars of the insanity of the Earl of Arran, and the meditated treason of Bothwell: "It is feared that my Lord of Arran will return unto his old madness. Within these five nights he would have slain a poor fellow that attendeth upon him. He rose out of his bed, and took a knife to have cut his throat in the night. The Duke (his father) will be here in three days. If the Earl of Bothwell receive not favour shortly at this Queen's hands, he purposeth to be suitor unto the Queen's Majesty Elizabeth, I know not for what."[1]

A week passed away while Randolph was vainly waiting for a second audience of the sick Queen. On the 21st of December he makes this report of her state: "Her disease — whereof it proceedeth I know not — daily increaseth. Her pain is in her right side. Men judge it to proceed of melancholy. She hath taken divers medicines of late, but findeth herself little the better. Upon Saturday she was out of her bed, but took no great pleasure in company, nor to have talk with any. For this cause I have forborne greatly to press her, having divers times, since the first talk with her Grace, been at the Court, that if her Grace had liked I might have further declared my Sovereign's mind."[2]

Queen Mary's bodily illness and mental depression were supposed by Randolph to have been painfully aggravated by a most distressing occurrence in her own palace and household, which is related in the coarsest terms, both by himself and Knox, and by the latter turned to her reproach, although when it happened she was sick nearly

[1] Randolph to Cecil, Dec. 13, 1563. State Paper MS., inedited.
[2] Randolph to Cecil, State Paper MS., inedited.

unto death, her physicians having for eight days despaired of her recovery.[1]

Her French apothecary had, it seems, seduced a young countrywoman of his, who served in her Majesty's chamber, and persuaded his victim to endeavour to conceal the consequences of their guilt by murder; but the cries of a newborn infant having been heard, the crime was detected, and, both parties being convicted of the same, were sentenced to undergo the penalty of the law, and were hanged in the High Street at Edinburgh, to the great sorrow of many of the royal household.

On this tragedy the popular ballad of "Mary Hamilton" is supposed to have been founded. The author—an anonymous bard of great poetic genius, but small research, having apparently confused Knox's unjust insinuations against Mary Livingstone, related in the same page, with this horrible story—has transformed the unhappy French girl into one of the Scotch maids of honour, without being correctly informed of their surnames:—

"Yestreen the Queen had four Maries,
This night she'll ha'e but three;
There was Mary Beton, and Mary Seton,
And Mary Carmichael, and me."

Neither a Mary Hamilton nor a Mary Carmichael were ever included among the catalogue of the Queen's female attendants. The author of one of the versions of the ballad, with allowable poetic license, represents the inquiry into the cause of the infant's cries as proceeding from the lips of Royalty:—

"Queen Mary came tripping down the stair,
Wi' the gold strings in her hair;
'O, whare's the little babie,' she says,
'That I heard greet sae sair?'"

The Queen's desire to preserve the life of her unfortunate attendant is introduced in the following stanza:—

"O hald your tongue, Mary Hamilton,
Let all those words go free;
This night, ere ye be hangit,
Ye shall gang hame wi' me."

[1] Randolph to Cecil, State Paper MS., inedited.

But the public shame having been incurred, the royal grace is thus proudly declined by the culprit, who insists on undergoing her sentence rather than return to the palace under so dishonouring a cloud—a characteristic trait of national pride surviving the loss of virtue:—

> "O hald your tongue, Queen Mary, my dame,
> Let all those words go free;
> Since I have come to Edinburgh town,
> It's hanged I shall be;
> For it shall ne'er be said that in your court
> I was condemned to dee."

The same week that the extreme penalty of the law was executed on the Queen's foreign apothecary and his youthful victim, the Lord-Treasurer of Scotland, Richardson—who was one of the chief men of the Congregation—was, for a similar act of immorality, put to open penance, by standing in a white sheet in St Giles's church during the time of divine service; and this disgraceful fact Randolph tells the grave Cecil, "he is particularly willed by my Lord of Moray to communicate to him, as a note of their severity in the punishment of offenders."

It must be evident to every one who has studied Randolph's reports of Queen Mary's health at this period (December 1563), that she was in a state very closely resembling that of her royal father after the disaster at Solway Moss—suffering from nervous fever, oppressed with morbid melancholy, and utterly unable to attend to business—that her attempts to exert herself for that purpose aggravated her malady, and her physicians entertained serious apprehensions for her life. John Knox, nevertheless, details the particulars of a very remarkable scene, which he affirms took place at this juncture between himself and the Queen, of whose severe and dangerous illness, however, he takes not the slightest notice. Two members of his congregation having been arrested and thrown into prison for raising a riot in the Chapel-royal at Holyrood, to prevent the service said there, during the Queen's absence, for her French ladies and servants, Knox wrote a letter, exhorting the brethren in all parts of Scotland to convene in Edinburgh on the day

appointed for the trial of the offenders; in other words, to excite a tumult in the metropolis, the effect of which might have been to rekindle the horrors of anarchy and religious warfare. So serious did the aspect of affairs appear to the legislators of the realm, that Randolph tells Cecil—"The Lords had assembled themselves for three causes, of which the last was to take order with John Knox and his faction, who intended, by a mutinous assembly, made by his letter before, to have rescued two of their brethren, Cranstoun and Armstrong, from course of law, for using an outrage on a priest saying mass to the Queen's household in Holyrood House."[1] The Earl of Moray and the Secretary Lethington sent for Knox, in the first instance, to the Clerk-Register's house, and remonstrated with him on the misdemeanour of which they considered he had been guilty, in convocating the Queen's lieges on his own authority, and without her leave; but as he persisted in justifying himself for what he had done, with many cutting innuendoes on their change of politics, no good resulted from this interview; and four days later he was summoned into the awful presence of the Queen and her Privy Council.[2] "The time," he tells us, "was between six and seven at night, the season of the year the midst of December"[3]—when, according to Randolph, the Queen was so dangerously ill that her recovery was considered by her physicians very doubtful; and Randolph could not be mistaken, seeing that he presented himself daily in her antechamber to make inquiries concerning her health, for the information of his own Sovereign; whereas Knox penned his History between four and five years later, when Mary was discrowned, and incarcerated in Lochleven; and he was daily anathematising her from the pulpit, and clamouring for her blood: due caution is therefore requisite in receiving his evidence of any part of her conduct. The particulars of the scene are, however, too curious to be omitted in a personal history of Mary.

"The bruit rising in the town that John Knox was sent

[1] Randolph to Cecil, Dec. 21, 1563, State Paper MS.
[2] Knox's Hist. of the Reformation in Scotland, vol. ii. p. 403. [3] Ibid.

for by the Queen, the brethren of the Kirk followed in such numbers that the inner close was full, and all the stairs, even to the chalmer-door where the Queen and Council sat, who had been reasoning among themselves before, but had not fully satisfied the Secretary's mind. And so was the Queen retired to her cabinet." The Privy Councillors had left the board, and were standing about in scattered groups, conversing on indifferent topics, when Knox was introduced. He exerts his sarcastic powers of language in describing the formal ceremonials with which they resumed their places in due order of precedency; and when all were arranged, the stately entrance of the Queen, together with the deferential behaviour of her ministers, or "*placeboes*" as he styles them, which especially excited his scorn. "Things thus put in order," he says, "the Queen came forth, and with no little worldly pomp was placed in the chair, having *twa* faithful supports—the Master of Maxwell upon the one tower, and Secretary Lethington on the other tower of the chair." The form of Mary's throne, or canopied chair of state, with Gothic pinnacles surmounting the open towers on either side, may be seen on her Great Seal. The two state officers who were in immediate attendance on her person stood in these towers, to be in readiness to perform her behests, and to assist her when she rose. To a man from the people, like the great Reformer, unaccustomed to courtly ceremonials, and of republican principles, such observances appeared almost ludicrous. He describes those two gentlemen as waiting diligently upon her all the time of his accusation, sometimes the one occupying her ear, sometimes the other. "Her pomp," continues he, "lacked one principal point—to wit, womanly gravity; for when she saw John Knox standing at the other end of the table bareheaded, she first smiled, and after gave *ane gawf laughter*" [1]—a horse-laugh, believe it who will. Levity like this would have been inexcusable in a thoughtless girl who had never entered the precincts of a palace before, but strange indeed in a princess accustomed from her cradle to support the dignified deportment and self-control of the regal character. One thing is

[1] Hist. Ref. Scot.

certain, "that the lack of womanly gravity," of which her formidable adversary accuses her, could not have occurred at a more unseasonable moment; for, by his own account, her palace was surrounded by a mob of his excited followers, some of whom were audaciously swarming up the staircase, and besetting the door of the council-chamber where she sat, with no better protection for her person than twelve civilians, of whom the majority were the bribed tools of the English Sovereign. And how could Mary expect to impress with a salutary dread of her displeasure the man who had endeavoured to excite a tumult in her metropolis, if she could not summon one frown to *daunton* him, but allowed tell-tale smiles and irrepressible laughter to betray the fact that the whole scene was a farce, that she was in the Euphrosyne vein on that occasion, and could not assume the terrors of an offended Juno? Moreover, her risibility, he tells us, was infectious; for her placeboes laughed too, and applauded. "But wot ye whereat I laugh?" said she. "Yon man gart me *greet*, and *grat* never tear himself; I will see if I can *gar* him *greet*."[1] Then the Secretary whispered her in the ear, and she him again, and gave him a letter, whereupon he composed his countenance, and addressed Knox in these words: "The Queen's Majesty is informed that ye have travailit to raise a tumult of her subjects against her; and for certification thereof there is presented unto her your own letter, subscribed with your own hand; yet, because her Grace will do nothing without good advisement, she has convened you before this part of her nobility, that they may witness between you and her." "Let him acknowledge," said the Queen, "his own hand-write, and then shall we judge of the contents of the letter." Then the letter being passed from hand to hand to John Knox, he not only owned it, but significantly observed that "no forgeries had been interpolated in the spaces he had left blank"[2]—a remark which appears to have emphatic reference to the practices of the leading members of the Cabinet, Lethington and Moray. "Ye have done more than I would have done," observed Lethington. "Charity is not suspicious," replied Knox.

[1] Knox, Hist. Ref., vol. ii. p. 404. [2] Ibid.

"Well, well," interrupted the Queen, "read your own letter, and then answer to such things as shall be demanded of you." Having read it to the end with a loud voice, it was handed to Mr John Spens, the Queen's advocate, "who was commanded to accuse, which he did, but very gently." "Heard you ever, my lords, a more despiteful and treasonable letter?" asked the Queen, looking round the table.[1] Silence appearing to give consent, Lethington asked Knox "if he did not repent, and was not heartily sorry such a letter should have proceeded from his pen?"—this acknowledgment being all that was required from him. But worlds combined would not have drawn an acknowledgment of error from Knox, especially if he considered himself in the right, which apparently was always the case with him. He protested he had committed no offence, done nothing but what was needful. A skirmish ensued between Lethington and him, in which Knox gave my Lord Secretary a sharp remembrance of the time when he formed a leading member in previous conventions, convocated in defiance of the authority of the Crown. "What is this?" interrupted the Queen, turning to Lethington; "methinks you trifle with him. Who gave him authority to make convention of my lieges?—is not that treason?" "*Na*, Madam," interposed Lord Ruthven, "for he makes convocation of the people to hear prayers and sermons almost daily; and whatever your Grace or others will think thereof, we think it no treason." "Hold your peace," said the Queen, "and let him answer for himself." "I began," said John Knox, "to reason with the *Secratour*, whom I take to be ane far better *dialectician* than your Grace is, that all convocations are not unlawful; and now my Lord Ruthven hath given the instance, which your Grace will not deny." "I will say nothing," replied Mary, "against your religion, nor against your convening to your sermons, but what authority have ye to convocate my subjects when ye will, without my commandment?" Knox alleged "that he had the authority of the Kirk for what he had done, and therefore could not be in the wrong." Instead of taking up the

[1] Knox, Hist. Ref., vol. ii. p. 404.

gauntlet on the subject of church infallibility, a dogma which savoured of Knox's Romish education, Mary attacked him on the seditious language in his letter. "Is it not treason, my Lords," asked she, "to accuse a Prince of cruelty? I think there be acts of Parliament against such whisperers." This was allowed. "But whereuntil," asked Knox, "can I be accused?" "Read this part of your own bill," said the Queen, quoting the following words from his own letter: "this fearful summons is direct against them (to wit, the two rioters Cranstoun and Armstrong),[1] 'to make, no doubt, preparation upon a few, that a door may be opened to execute cruelty upon a greater multitude.' 'Lo,' said the Queen, 'what say ye to that?' 'Is it lawful for me, Madam, to answer for myself,' asked Knox, 'or sall I be damned before I be heard?' 'Say what ye can,' returned she, 'for I think ye have enough to do.'" His defence was, that he alluded not to her in his letter, nor yet to her cruelty, but to the cruelty of Papists; affirming that "the pestilent Papists who had inflamed her Grace against those puir men (Cranstoun and Armstrong) were the sons of the devil, and therefore must obey the desires of their father, who was a liar and a murtherer from the beginning." "Ye forget yourself," said one of the Council, "ye are not now in the pulpit." "I am in that place," he undauntedly replied, "where I am demanded of conscience to speak the truth; and hereunto, Madam, I add that honest, gentle, and meek natures by appearance"—a half compliment was here insinuated to Mary herself, who, even by his own account, behaved with imperturbable good-humour—"by wicked and corrupt counsellors may be converted, and alter to the direct contrair: example we have of Nero." While Knox was winding up the application and moral of this obliging parallel, Lethington was, with ready tact, adroitly diverting her Majesty's attention from his eloquence, by speaking secretly in her ear some observations which excited the curiosity of the other, "but what it was the table heard not." Immediately afterwards Mary

[1] These were really dangerous and bloody-minded men, being afterwards engaged in the assassination of David Riccio.

turned her face towards her formidable opponent and said, "Well, ye speak fair enough here before my Lords, but the last time I spake with you secretly, ye caused me weep many salt tears, and said to me stubbornly ye set not by my greeting." [1]

In reply to this, Knox entered into a recapitulation of the particulars of the scene in her cabinet, where she offended him as much by her weeping as on the present occasion by her unlucky fit of laughter. It is to be observed, however, that he did not apply the term "howling" to her hysterical emotion, when alluding to it in her own presence before the Lords of her Council. He repeated that he "never took any pleasure in seeing any creature weep; yea, not his children, when his own hands had beaten them; much less did he rejoice to see her Grace make such regret." [2] After Lethington and the Queen had conferred together for a moment, Lethington said to him, "Mr Knox, ye may return to your house for this night." "I thank God and the Queen's Majesty," responded Knox; "and, Madam, I pray God to purge your heart from Papistry, and to preserve you from the counsel of flatterers; for how pleasant that they appear to your ear and corrupt affection for the time, experience has taught us in what perplexity they have brought famous princes." [2] This was another hard hit at Lethington, and truly Knox could not say more against him than his serpentine qualities merited. "The Queen retired to her cabinet while the question was put to the vote of the Council whether John Knox had offended her Majesty or not, and the Lords uniformly voted that he had not; whereat the flatterers, and principally Lethington, raged." He was, moreover, guilty of the folly of inducing the sick and exhausted young Queen to re-enter and take the chair again, while he put the same question a second time to the vote. This illegal attempt raised a storm in her very presence. "What!" exclaimed the majority, "shall the Laird of Lethington have power to control us, or shall the presence of a woman cause us to offend God, and to condemn an innocent person against our

[1] Knox, Hist. Ref., vol. ii. p. 410. [2] Ibid.

conscience for pleasure of any creature?" "That night," notes Knox, "there was neither dancing nor fiddling in the Court, for Madam was disappointed of her purpose, which was to have had John Knox in her will by vote of her nobility."[1] Queen Mary was certainly not in a state to render dancing and fiddling practicable, though to preside at that agitating Council she had been taken out of her sick-bed, loaded with her regal trappings, and led, poor suffering victim to the pains and penalties of royalty, at the peril of life, into a stormy conclave of wrangling statesmen —pitiless traitors, for the most part—placed on her throne, and compelled by her ministers to take upon herself the unpopular responsibility of calling the most formidable man in her realm to account for the misdemeanour of exciting an insurrectionary movement in her metropolis; his factious followers meantime beleaguering the doors of the chamber where the question was discussed, and ready to burst in upon her. What a situation for a young female Sovereign, whose physical strength and mental energies were prostrated by a long and severe illness! A week later, Mary was still confined to her chamber, and unable to leave her bed, though the repose and seclusion so necessary for the restoration of her health were denied to the royal patient. "Divers times," writes Randolph to Cecil, "since my last letters to your Honour, I have been at the Court two times together in her Grace's sight; but she at both times lying in her bed, conferring with her Council about such matters as were in consultation among the Lords of this Assembly, that time, as she said unto myself, served her not to talk with me."

"Upon Sunday the 26th,[2] I had warning in the morning to come to the Court after dinner. At my coming I found in her Grace's chamber, besides ladies and gentlewomen, many of her Grace's Council, herself keeping yet her bed, and talking with the Earl of Moray and Lord of Lethington. Their purposes ended, her Grace beginneth with me in this sort: 'I long now, Mr Randolph, to hear what answer you have brought me from my good sister your mistress. I

[1] Knox, Hist. Ref., ii. 412. [2] Randolph to Cecil, Dec. 31, 1563.

am sure that it cannot but be good unto me, seeing it cometh of so good mind as my sister beareth me.' " Randolph responded to this encouraging compliment from the royal invalid, by commending her friendly feeling towards his Sovereign, whose thoughts were daily on her state, and what would be the fittest for her in regard to marriage;—in reality, the cleverest way she could devise of keeping the fair northern Queen from entering into the troublesome estate of matrimony. " The Queen of England thought," observes Michel de Castelnau, " that she could not have any thorn in her foot to prick her more sharply than a powerful Continental marriage for her sister of Scotland." [1] Among all Mary's numerous suitors there was not one whose pretensions were agreeable to Elizabeth, who required Mary not to wed without being assured of her approbation, but to be guided in her choice by her. Mary failed not to compliment Elizabeth by consulting her on the subject of every offer she had predetermined not to accept, and appeared very dutifully satisfied with Elizabeth's reasons for requesting her to reject all. Elizabeth was especially jealous of the Archduke Charles having transferred his addresses from her to Mary. She knew that Cardinal Lorraine had arranged the preliminary articles for that alliance, with the Emperor, at Inspruck, in the preceding August; but she was not aware that Mary had been exceedingly annoyed at this proceeding, which was far more displeasing to her than even to Master John Knox.[2]

When Mary confided this proposal to Elizabeth, and expressed her determination not to conclude any treaty of the kind that might be displeasing to her, Elizabeth replied, " that it was a match which she had weighty political reasons for opposing, and that if Mary would, instead of marrying a foreign prince, consent to accept a consort of her selecting, she would adopt her as a daughter, and gratify her in anything she could reasonably demand." The great object of Mary's ambition was to obtain a formal recognition of

[1] Memoirs de Castelnau, in Jebb.

[2] Keith.

her right to the succession of the English crown, and in order to propitiate Elizabeth's favour for that purpose, she was willing to give up not only the Archduke, but the whole train of her royal suitors, and to entertain the overtures that were made to her in behalf of the mysterious Englishman who was recommended to her attention by Elizabeth's representative, in terms which appeared applicable to none other than her princely kinsman, Henry, Lord Darnley. "Her Majesty" (Queen Elizabeth), "thought," said Randolph, "that none fitter could be found than some nobleman of her realm, who, besides the many good virtues that might be found in him, should also have a special desire to unite the two countries, and to live in perpetual peace and concord." [1]

"I assure you" replied Mary, "the Queen, my good sister, is no better willing to continue amity than I am; and if we had so well known one another as now we do, I think the matter had been out of doubt. Touching her desire of my marriage, I may conceive more than in plain terms your mistress will signify, or you list to utter; but how will the world allow of that I know not:" [2] to which the subtle diplomatist rejoined, "He that ruleth all his actions by the judgment of the world, doth not most commonly govern himself best. The world judgeth more of dignity, reputation, and honour than what is meet for the preservation of amity between princes, peace and quietness between subjects, and love and good-will between neighbours, as was seen in your Majesty's late marriage, which now time hath discovered to have been one of the greatest inconveniences that could be to your state, whereby not only enmity was perpetually nourished, but your whole country like in time to have fallen into the hands of others, of which no small numbers had already planted themselves in your Majesty's holds and strengths." The spirit of the royal widow was chafed by disparaging reflections on a connection so dear to her heart and memory as her marriage with Francis de Valois. "Her Grace scarce heard these words with patience," continues Randolph, "and therefore

[1] Keith. [2] Ibid.

I tarried no longer upon them."[1] "You have, Master Randolph, some other matter to say unto me, I am sure, than this," she observed. "Let me know plainly what your mistress's mind is, that I may the better devise with myself, and confer with other, and so be able to give you a more resolute answer than by these general words spoken by you I can." As it did not suit the ambassador to return a plain answer to this requisition, Mary, who was probably exhausted by the fatigue of continuing the conversation, postponed further discussion in these words: "I have many things more to inquire of you than these we have spoken of, and these require time to be considered of; wherefore we will talk more at leisure, myself being better at ease, and the business ended for which I have assembled my nobles." Randolph said he would wait her Majesty's pleasure, and, taking his leave of her, retired into the background, without quitting the chamber. Mary then called the Earl of Argyll, her sister's husband, to her pillow, and, after some private discourse with him, said, "Randolph would have me marry in England;" to which he merrily rejoined, "Is the Queen of England become a man?"[2]

Without noticing this jest, Mary pursued the subject, by asking him playfully, "Who is there in that country you would wish me to?" "Whom your Grace could like the best," he replied, and "wished there were so noble a man there as she could like." "That would not please the Duke," rejoined her Majesty—distinctly pointing at Lord Darnley as the man of her choice, by this allusion to the feud betwixt the houses of Lennox and Hamilton. Argyll, though he understood not his fair liege lady's meaning, replied discreetly, "If it please God, and be good for your Majesty's country, what reck who were displeased?"[3] More discourse had Queen Mary with the Earl, which he, a secret confederate for her marriage with the favourite of the English Sovereign, repeated, like the sorry fellow he was, to Randolph.[4] "What he thinketh of that matter

[1] Randolph to Cecil, Dec. 31, 1563. State Paper Office MS., inedited.
[2] Ibid. [3] Ibid. [4] Ibid.

himself," observes the ambassador to his correspondent, Cecil, "and whom he liketh best of, he hath given sufficient declaration of his mind. If this Queen purpose to send any nobleman unto the Queen's Majesty, I will do what I can that he may go." The courtiers were very pressing to learn of Randolph who was the English nobleman intended for their Queen, some guessing Darnley, and some the Earl of Warwick, none suspecting that Lord Robert Dudley could be the person meant, "except," observes the ambassador, "the very few to whom I dare safely and more largely talk." And one of that chosen few was the young Scottish Sovereign's trusty premier and loving brother, the Earl of Moray, "who seemed to like well of it."[1]

No sense of national or family honour led the base son of James V. to object to the lineage of the cadet grandson of Dudley the extortioner, as unmeet to disparage the royal stream of Stuart, by mingling with that of the representative of a hundred kings. No tender care for the life of his sister and benefactress impelled him to shrink from joining the confederacy for consigning her to the arms of a man "infamed by the death of his first wife." Belike the wife-killing reputation of the Lord Robert was the reason he was chosen for the husband of Mary Stuart. Neither moral delicacy nor religious scruples inspired a doubt as to the propriety of allowing so profligate a man as the minion of Elizabeth to be united to the Sovereign of a reformed realm; it was sufficient for the Earl of Moray that he was the man whom the Queen of England delighted to honour. But although he consented to the arrangement, he had not sufficient temerity to undertake to communicate it to Mary, much less to recommend it to her.

Queen Mary was sufficiently amended, on New-Year's day, to invite Randolph to dine with her; and being fully recovered on Twelfth-day, she gave a brilliant entertainment and ball to her Court, and initiated the nobles and ladies of her household into the attractive French pastime called the Feast of the Bean[2]—a game similar to the English

[1] Randolph to Cecil, Jan. 13—Keith.
[2] Ibid., Jan. 15. State Paper Office MS.

observance of drawing for King and Queen. The bean was concealed in the Twelfth-cake, and whoever got it was treated as the sovereign for that night. The bean in the Holyrood Twelfth-cake fell to the lot of Mary Fleming on that festive night, and her royal mistress, the Mary of Maries, indulgently humoured the frolic by arraying her in her own regal robes, and decorating her with her choicest jewels, wearing none herself that evening, that the Queen of the Bean might shine peerless—a trait, trifling though it were, distinctly characteristic of the generosity of Queen Mary's temper, and the delicacy of her mind.

Randolph, who had commenced an active courtship of Mary Beton, another of the fair maids of honour, gives an animated account of the fête to Lord Robert Dudley, which he prefaces with facetious allusions to the good fortune of that courtier, in being selected by his Sovereign for the consort of the beauteous Majesty of Scotland. "I assure your Lordship," writes he, "the worst I intend you is to marry a Queen. Thus much with your Lordship's pardon. I will now see what other pleasant matter there is to write of than this, not doubting but your Lordship will think better hereafter of my doings than yet you can, for the little hope you have to bring so great a matter to pass. Touching the state of things here, it may please your Lordship to know that the Queen hath recovered much of her health. The ladies and gentlewomen are all in health and merry, which your Lordship should have seen if you had been here upon Tuesday, at the great solemnity and royal estate of the Queen of the Bean. Fortune was so favourable to fair Fleming, that, if she could have seen to have judged of her virtue and beauty as blindly as she went to work, and chose her at adventure, she would sooner have made her a Queen for life, than for one only day to exalt her so high, and the next to leave her in the state she found her. If Beton had liked so short a time so worthy a room, Fleming, by good right, should have given place. They lacked only for so noble a heart a worthy realm to endue that with. That day it was to be seen, by her princely pomp, how fit a match she would be, were she to contend

either with Venus in beauty, Minerva in wit, or Juno in worldly wealth—having the two former by nature, and of the third so much as is contained in this realm at her command and free disposition. The treasure of Solomon, I trow, was not to be compared unto that which hanged upon her back. Happy was it unto this realm that her reign endured no longer. Two such sights in one state, in so good accord, I believe was never seen, as to behold two worthy Queens possess, without envy, one kingdom both upon a day. I leave the rest unto your Lordship to be judged of. My pen staggereth, my hand faileth farther to write. Their praises surmount whatsoever may be thought of them. The Queen of the Bean was that day in a gown of cloth-of-silver; her head, her neck, her shoulders, the rest of her whole body, so beset with stones that more in 'our whole Jewel-house' were not to be found.

"Queen Mary herself, apparelled that day in colours white and black, no other jewel or gold about her but the ring that I brought her from the Queen's Majesty hanging at her breast, with a lace of white and black about her neck. The cheer that day was great. I never found myself so happy, nor so well treated, until that it came unto the point that the old Queen [Mary] herself, to show her mighty power, contrary unto the assurance granted me by the younger Queen [Mary Fleming, Queen of the Bean], drew me into the dance, which part of the play I could with good will have spared unto your Lordship, as much fitter for the purpose. This ended the joy of their holiday: from that time to this we have lived as before."[1]

After this animated sketch of Twelth-night at Holyrood, from the pen of the enamoured English ambassador, a few particulars illustrative of the domestic economy of Mary Stuart's household may not be unacceptable. The regulations, diet, and allowances for the year 1562 have been carefully jotted down by her French comptroller, Monsieur Pinguillon, and apparently furnish the model on which her widow establishment was conducted. From this curious record it appears that every person in the royal household,

[1] Wigton Papers, No. 3. Miscellany of the Maitland Club, vol. ii. part ii.

from the Queen to the humblest female servant, had a separate and distinct quota apportioned of the necessaries of life—such as bread, wine, eggs, candles, coals, wood, and other articles. The allowance of candles from the first day of November till the last day of March, per day, was, for the chamber and cabinet of the Queen, three quarters of a pound only, and one pound for her dining-room.[1] In the spring and summer months this quantity was diminished one-third. Madame de Briante, or Brêne, who had been Mary's governess, was allowed a quarter of a pound of candles; so was Madame de Crig, another French lady of her household, and Mademoiselle Cobron. The four Maries had half a pound between them; so had the juvenile maidens of the Court, and their governess, Mademoiselle de Souche. The Queen's female fool and Jaqueline, who figure in M. Pinguillon's list under the names of La Jardinière and her governess, are allowed a quarter of a pound between them. Mary's secretary, Raulet, is allowed no more; the other gentlemen officers of the household and servants in like proportion. The average sum-total of candles allowed for burning on a winter day and night in Holyrood, or any other palace in which Queen Mary kept her state, amounted to fifteen pounds, three quarters, and half a quarter. But there was also the following allowance of white wax: for the chamber of the Queen, three flambeaux of half a pound weight each, and four bougies, or tapers, weighing a quarter of a pound each, and a flambeau of yellow wax weighing half a pound. Madame de Briante, the four Maries, Mademoiselle Cobron, had each a yellow wax bougie of one ounce weight; so had the junior maids of honour, Grisel, the younger Livingstone, and Mademoiselle de la Souche their governess, and three bedchamber-women, named Thara, Françoise, and Courcelles. The coals delivered for the chamber and cabinet of the Queen were two charges, and for her presence-chamber and dining-room three charges. Madame de Briante had one charge; the maids of honour two charges between them; La Jardinière and her governess, who are

[1] Menu de la Maison de la Royne.

never forgotten, one charge; the doctor and apothecary, only half a charge each.

The bill of fare for the Queen's dinner on flesh days included four sorts of soup and four entrés, a piece of beef-royal boiled, a high loin of mutton, and a capon. Her roast-meats were one joint of mutton, one capon, three pullets or pigeons, three hares or rabbits, and two pieces of fat meat. For her dessert she had seven dishes of fruit, and one of a paste composed of chicory. Her supper was a repetition of the same dishes as her dinner; and the like fare was served at the tables of her ladies and the officers of her household. One gallon of wine served her Majesty and her company for the morning collation and evening refreshment, and at her dinner-table, one quart of white wine and one of claret. Eight rolls of bread were supplied to the royal table at every meal. The Queen's ladies dined in classes at separate tables: for instance, at the first table dined Madame de Briante, Madame de Crig, Mademoiselles Pinguillon, Cobron, and Fontpertuis, and the four Maries—nine persons in all. They were allowed a gallon of wine among them, two rolls of bread each, and the same diet as their royal Mistress. Each of these ladies had a man-servant, who dined with an officer called the Usher of the Ladies, and the passementier, a needleman, who was employed in working the borders of dresses. Their maids dined at a separate table with La Jardinière and her governess, the wife of William of Vienne, one of the butlers, and Annibal, one of the Queen's pages. La Jardinière had also a man-servant, who dined with menials of lower degree. There was a separate table, with all suitable allowances, for Mademoiselle de la Souche, the governess of the junior maids of honour, who are enumerated in Pinguillon's list as the younger Livingstone and the younger Beton, Grissel, Thire, Chou—a pet name, of course—La Sauvage, and Raulay.[1] It is to be observed, that he very improperly places Mademoiselle Pinguillon even before Madame de Briante, the noble matron who had had the honour of being governess to the Queen. At the table

[1] Menu de la Maison de la Royne.

of the valets-de-chambre dined the Queen's French musicians, Michellet, Balthasar, Servais de Conde, Adrian, and David Riccio—who is not in the slightest degree privileged above his messmates; Guillaume, Denis Bassecontre, Guillaume Gendrot, Martin Mingnon, four Scotch singers, a Scotch usher of the chamber, the tailor Maguichon, René the perfumer, and two little French singers—nineteen persons in all, who were allowed at their dinner one gallon and two quarts of wine among them, two rolls a-piece, and the following diet: four dishes of soup, two entrés, two pieces of boiled beef, one boiled capon, and two pieces of boiled mutton; two pieces of roast mutton, and a dish called *un gros*. Supper, the same repeated—good plain fare, but no dainties to indicate that a man whom the Queen delighted to honour fed at this board. So strict is the regard to economy in Mary's household arrangements, that a note is appended after a very meagre bill of fare for the Queen's ladies on the fish days: "Care will be taken to reduce the allowance for this table, after Mademoiselles Pinguillon and Fontpertuis are gone to France." [1]

Charges appear in the Compotus "for green plaiding, to make ane bed to Jardinière the *fule*, with white fustians, fedders, &c.; and an *abuilziement* for Jaqueline, governess to La Jardinière." [2] This functionary received a salary of forty pounds per annum, was allowed a man-servant, and honourable diet in the court, with a choppin of wine and a choppin of ale at every meal. Mary had also a Scotch female droll in her establishment, who wore the royal livery, as we find from the entry "of ane garment of red and yellow, to be ane gown, hose, and coat for Jane Colquhoun, *fule*." [3] Then there was "James Geddes, *fule*," the recipient of ane yellow coat and breeches; and "Nicola, *fule*," [4] a foreign female, who lingered at Holyrood after the deposition of her royal mistress for nearly three years, and, becoming probably hopeless of her restoration, returned to France in 1570.

[1] Maison de Marie Stuart, in M. Teulet's Pièces et Documens relatifs des Affaires d'Escosses.

[2] Royal Exchequer Records, Register House, Edinburgh.

[3] Ibid. [4] Ibid.

The salaries of Queen Mary's French ladies and officers, including her staff of cooks, bakers, and butlers, were all paid out of the rents of her French jointure-lands. Her Scotch maids of honour, bedchamber-women, laundress of the body, her six Scotch equerries and carvers—in short, almost all the Scotch ladies and gentlemen who had been in her service when she was Dauphiness and Queen-Consort of France, were paid from the same fund, but not at the same high rate as during the life of her royal husband, Francis II.; for she had found herself under the necessity, when she was reduced to the inferior state of a Queen-Dowager, of curtailing the wages of her household in proportion to the reduction of her own income. Her governess, Madame Briante, received only 300 livres under the retrenched scale which took place at the close of the year 1560; Mary Seton, and the other Scotch maids of honour, received 200 livres per annum each; Arthur Erskine and two other Scotch equerries, and her head carver Beton, had salaries of 300 livres per annum; Robin Hamilton, her Scotch porter, 20; and John Lyon, one of the officers in the kitchen department, 41 livres. The sum total disbursed in one year in pensions and wages to Queen Mary's French and Scotch servants, amounted to 34,320 livres tournois,[1]—equal to crowns in those days, and very nearly to pounds according to the present computation of money. So largely did Mary Stuart—a fact little understood by generalising historians—draw upon her personal resources, that she might spare her own impoverished realm from the miseries of increased taxation to support the dignity of the Crown. Never was any Sovereign so little burdensome to her people, or more attentive to their general weal.

In the list of gentlemen attached to Queen Mary's household appears the name of Jehan de Court, painter, with a salary of £240 per annum. Such of her Scottish portraits as are really originals were probably painted by this domestic artist. Among the miniatures claiming to be

[1] Royal Exchequer Records, Register House, Edinburgh. See also Negociations, Lettres, &c., relatives au Règne de François II., par M. Louis, p. 744. Paris.

authentic likenesses of Mary Stuart, is one preserved at Ham House, in the Earl of Dysart's collection, supposed to have been inherited by the Duke of Lauderdale from his ancestor, the celebrated Sir William Maitland, Lord of Lethington, Mary's Secretary of State, the husband of Mary Fleming, to whom it was probably presented by her royal mistress and namesake. Mary is there depicted in the widow's dress she wore in Scotland till her second marriage—black, trimmed with white—her head-tire being a shovel-shaped black hood, flat and wide in front, and descending from the ears like a stiff slanting frame on each side the throat; over this a black veil is thrown back;—a costume very unbecoming to any features less exquisite than those of the royal beauty, who is there represented in her twentieth or twenty-first year—pensive, but very lovely, with pale clear complexion and dark hazel eyes. Her hair, bright chestnut colour, is folded in Madonna bands across her broad serene forehead, with braids sloping towards her cheeks; the contour of her face is oval; her gown is black figured damask, slashed on the breast and sleeves, and these slashes are edged with narrow white fur; a partlet of the same encircles her throat. This miniature is an oval of very small size, and round the edge of the deep-blue background is inscribed "Maria Regina Scotorum," in gold letters, and "Catharine da Costa, pinx.,"—being the first instance of a female artist's name connected with a royal portrait; but it is a perfect gem of its kind.

Mary had gardens to all her palaces, in which she was accustomed to take early walks for exercise before breakfast, and often, like Elizabeth, transacted regal business with her ministers, and gave audience to foreign ambassadors during her walks. She had two gardens at Holyrood Abbey—one northern, the other southern. In these she took great delight, and replenished them with fruit and flowers from France. Two stately plane-trees, in extreme old age, were, within the memory of man, fondly pointed out by tradition as Queen Mary's plane-trees, supposed to have been planted by her own hand on her return from France. The remains of her bath-house are still shown.

Her sun-dial has been removed to a spot worthy of such a relic—the charming pleasance of Fingask Castle, the seat of Sir Peter Murray Threipland, Bart., in Perthshire.

Robert Rhynd, gardener of the Queen's yard at Perth, received ten marks yearly during his life, by her precept, for keeping the same.[1] She had also gardens and parks at Falkland, Linlithgow, and Stirling, where she sometimes amused herself with practising archery, by shooting at the butts with her ladies and nobles of high rank. She could play chess and billiards, and was fond of cards; but there are no records of her losses or gains at play.

[1] Register of Signatures. Chalmers.

MARY STUART

CHAPTER XIV.

SUMMARY

Queen Mary and her Court in good peace—Intrigues for her marriage with Dudley—Queen Mary warned by her uncle, Cardinal Guise, of the base match intended—Shows part of the letter to Randolph—He discovers the rest through his spies in her household—Randolph's double-dealing—Queen Mary willing to marry an English subject, if a Prince—Fancies Darnley must be intended for her—Vow of her four Maries—Queen Mary's disinclination for wedlock—Advantages and disadvantages of a marriage with Darnley—Queen Mary blamed by Knox about the weather—She resolves to be merry—Great political crisis—Quarrel between the Queen and her brother Moray—She is required to give up the Mass—She offers to abdicate—Moray rejects the government—Queen believes him sincere—She sends for him to Court—Festivities and re-unions—Shrovetide banquet—Her verses—She goes to Dunbar—Fears of her leaving Scotland—Her popularity—Duke of Anjou offered to her in marriage—Declines marrying a French subject—Discusses her princely suitors with Castelnau—Lord Robert Dudley formally proposed to her by Randolph—She keeps her temper, and consents to humour the negotiation—Countess of Lennox solicits her hand for Darnley—Queen Mary prayed for in imprecatory language by Knox—Her Highland progress, hunting, and sylvan sports—Her music meeting—Admiration of Scotch ballads—Her harp—Renewed negotiations for her marriage with Lord Robert Dudley—She recalls and pardons the Earl of Lennox.

QUEEN Mary had the satisfaction of calming, for a season, the discord between the struggling factions in her realm, so that, at the conclusion of her Christmas festivities, her nobles departed in peace to their own homes.[1] Her health was also so well restored that she talked of proceeding in person to hold her Justice Courts at Jedburgh, not-

[1] Randolph to Cecil, Jan. 15, 1563. State Paper Correspondence.

withstanding the inclemency of the coldest winter that had been known in Scotland for many years. The weather, however, was such as to prevent her from carrying her purpose into effect. Meantime, the intrigues for forcing her into an unworthy marriage with the favourite of the English Queen were proceeding, and still her request to be informed of the name of the peerless unknown whom her good sister had kindly selected for her consort, was parried with an evasive answer, and the intimation that the proper time for declaring it had not yet arrived. This alleged necessity for procrastination appeared to bear reference to the extreme youthfulness of their mutual kinsman, the Lord Darnley, the only English subject who was of sufficient rank to aspire to her hand, or whom she conceived her good sister of England would presume to propose to her. Ere long, however, the mystery was penetrated by the French ambassador resident at the English court; and Mary received a letter from her uncle, Cardinal de Guise, written by desire of her mother-in-law, the Queen-Regent, with whom she was not then on friendly terms, warning her of the disparaging alliance that was intended for her.[1]

"Upon Sunday last," writes Randolph to Queen Elizabeth, "I had many long purposes with her Grace's self. For testimony of the truth of all it pleased her Grace to report of her French news unto me, she let me have a sight of the Cardinal Guise's letter unto her. Of these things your Majesty shall have knowledge by Mr Secretary. In this letter there was somewhat more written in cipher, of which I got knowledge by *other means*, which I thought good to let your Majesty understand."[2] The channel through which our ambassadorial spy obtained his information, apparently required no explanation to his royal mistress; for well did Elizabeth know, from the first, who the perfidious traitors were by whom the secrets of their confiding Sovereign were bartered for English gold. Randolph communicates the substance of the intelligence, thus

[1] Randolph to Cecil, Jan. 15, 1563–4. State Paper MS., inedited.
[2] Randolph to Queen Elizabeth, Jan. 21, 1563–4. State Paper MS., inedited.

honourably acquired, in this emphatic passage:—"The French have gotten word what your Majesty intendeth towards this Queen, by advertisement of Monsieur de Foix to the Queen-mother (Catherine de Medicis); who, altogether misliking your Majesty's intent, persuadeth the Cardinal Guise to hinder the same. To that end he hath written to this Queen to this effect, that she should take heed unto these dealings that your Majesty hath with her, that you mean anything less than good faith, and that it proceedeth of fineness," (a polite word for falsehood), "to make her believe that you intend her good in seeking to have your Majesty's advice in her marriage, or that her honour shall be in any way advanced by marrying of any so base as either my Lord Robert or the Earl of Warwick" (his elder brother), "of which your Majesty is determined to take the one and give her the other."[1]

Cardinal Guise concluded his ciphered communication to his royal niece with the significant observation, "that she might rely on the correctness of his intelligence from de Foix, by the token of one who had been lately sent unto her from the Queen of England, with pearls and many rich jewels, to move her mind that way; but he could not see that it might stand with her greatness to imbase herself so much as that."[2] Mary, being aware that it was the policy of the French Court to break the amicable relations between her and the English Sovereign, paid no regard to assertions so strangely opposed to probability. She continued to lend an attentive ear to Randolph's flattering promises, and to express unbounded confidence in the good intentions of his royal mistress, "not doubting," she said, "that if she could bring her mind to marry in England, whosoever was the greatest there, and most worthy in all respects to marry a Queen, would be offered to her." Randolph was fully aware that Mary pointed at her kinsman Darnley, she having previously intimated, "that for any one to persuade her, who was born a queen, and had been the wife of a king, to marry any one under the degree of a prince,

[1] Randolph to Queen Elizabeth, Jan. 21, 1563–4. State Paper MS., inedited.

[2] Ibid.

could not be a friend of hers, or have a proper regard for her honour; and that his Sovereign, having assumed over her the dignity and authority of a mother, would not, she thought, proffer unto her any but the best."[1] Randolph, however, in order to compliment his patron, Lord Robert Dudley, assumes that this epithet applied to him, and puts in certain delicate questions as to the possibility of Queen Elizabeth resigning him, or of his consenting to exchange his envied post of reigning favourite to that mighty Sovereign, in case the Queen of Scots might be induced to accept him for a husband. Nothing can assuredly afford more conclusive evidence of the peculiar nature of the intimacy between Elizabeth and her handsome Master of the Horse than the comment on Mary's expectation, "that the best in England would be offered to her," thus plainly addressed by Randolph to Cecil. "But how evil-willing the Queen's Majesty (of England) would be to depart from him, and how hardly his mind could be diverted or drawn from that worthier room where it is placed, let any man see,[2] where it cannot be thought but it is so fixed for ever that the world would judge worse of him than of any living man, if he should not rather yield his life than alter his thought. Wherefore this they conclude as well for her Majesty's part as for him that is so happy to be so far in her Grace's favour, that if this Queen would wholly put herself into my Sovereign's will, that either she should not have the best or choice of the whole, or at least match herself with him that hath his mind placed already *elsewhere;* or, if it can be withdrawn from thence, she shall take a man unworthy for his disloyalty and inconstancy to marry with any, much less with a Queen. Whereupon they," — this emphatic pronoun refers to the secret junta in Mary's cabinet, who were Randolph and Cecil's confederates, and confidants in the English Sovereign's plot for marrying their royal mistress to Lord Robert Dudley, "they" (the Scotch confederates),

[1] Randolph to Queen Elizabeth, Jan. 21, 1563-4. State Paper MS., inedited.

[2] Randolph to Cecil, Feb. 21, 1563-4. State Paper Office MS., inedited.

"knowing their affections," (Elizabeth and Lord Robert Dudley's), "and judging them inseparable, think rather that no such thing is meant of my Sovereign's part," continues Randolph, "and that all these offers bear a greater show, and face of good-will, than any good meaning." [1]

Thus doubtful were even the secret-service men of Elizabeth whether it were her intention to do such needless violence to her own feelings, as to give the man she loved to their beautiful young Queen. On Mary's part it was asked "Why, since the Queen of England required her not to marry in the house of Austria, she would not deal so frankly with her as to name the person she desired her to wed?" Randolph's answers to this plain question were so mysterious that Mary confessed herself "fairly puzzled, and that she knew not what to say in reply to him." [2] "Sometimes," observes Randolph, "I offer and seem willing to take words out of her mouth as an answer. I then see them drawn back again from me, as though they had not been spoken. Sometimes 'she liketh well to hear of marriage,' many times 'the widow's life is best, honourable, quiet,' &c. Sometimes 'she may marry where she will;' sometimes 'she is sought of nobody.' I pity many times unto her 'her state and case, the loss of her time, the hurt to her country.' I commend to her 'the felicity of marriage, the joy and pleasure of such children as God may send her;' and if by no means I be able to move her to that which is most for her own commodity, and comfort to her subjects, 'yet, at the least, that she will take compassion upon her four Maries, her worthy daughters, and mignionnes, that for her sake have vowed themselves never to marry if she be not the first.'" [3] This romantic incident is one of the many new facts in the history of Mary Stuart and her Court, for which we are indebted to the lively ambassadorial reports of Master Randolph, and affords pleasing evidence of the affection subsisting between the royal Mary and the companions of her infancy and youth. The four Maries had entered into

[1] Randolph to Cecil, Feb. 21, 1563–4. State Paper Office MS., inedited.
[2] Ibid. [3] Ibid.

the above covenant in the hope of inducing their fair Sovereign to gratify the earnest desires of her subjects for her marriage; but their vow was a rash one, which, instead of hastening the matrimonial proceedings of Queen Mary, threatened to bind themselves to a life-long period of celibacy: the members of the fair sisterhood of namesakes being now turned of one-and-twenty, the four noble maidens began to be exposed to many impertinent pleasantries from the profane gallants of the Court, at the termination of every ineffectual attempt to induce their royal mistress to accept a second husband.

As it was evident that a matrimonial treaty was in progress, the object of which was said to be a perpetual bond of amity between England and Scotland, the marriage of Queen Mary with the first Prince of the blood-royal of the Tudor line, Henry Lord Darnley, was generally supposed to be the object of Randolph's secret instructions. Many faithful subjects were well content it should be so, as it presented a reasonable hope of the consolidation of the Britannic Empire, by the union of Queen Mary to the only person who was at all likely at a future period to contest her claims to the Crown of England. A strong party, however, including the houses of Hamilton and Douglas, and the recipients of the Earl of Lennox's forfeitures, expressed great dread "that strife might be engendered in the interim by the Queen's marriage with Darnley, on account of the cumber" which they said "might be caused in Scotland by his father and mother's titles;"[1] the one threatening to impugn the Duke of Châtelherault's legitimacy, in which, if he succeeded, not only the next place in the regal succession would fall to himself, but a vast portion of the hereditary demesnes of the house of Hamilton; while the Countess of Lennox at the same time asserted, with every appearance of justice, her right to the Earldom of Angus, and all the mighty appanages of her deceased father, Earl Archibald, which were at present held by her youthful cousin, a minor, under the guardianship of the Earl of Morton, her late father's nephew;—circumstances which may well explain the

[1] Randolph to Cecil, Feb. 21, 1563–4. State Paper Office MS., inedited.

jealous reluctance of the opposers of the Darnley alliance, and their confederation with the Queen of England to compel their Sovereign to become the wife of Lord Robert Dudley, in order to prevent her from that politic and proper marriage which, in theory at least, was well calculated to increase the power of the Crown of Scotland, as well as to insure the peaceful union of the realms. Mary was convinced that neither the high-sounding alliances of France, Austria, nor Spain, could offer such solid advantages as were promised by her union with Darnley, and was therefore perfectly ready to resign all her royal suitors in exchange for him, and her recognition as the lawful heiress to the throne of England, in the event of Elizabeth dying unmarried. Nor could she believe that any other English subject could be proposed to her.

The Queen-Regent of France, finding her hints of Elizabeth's perfidy disregarded, began now to court her royal daughter-in-law, not only with professions of affection for her person, but gave tangible proofs of her desire to conciliate her by sending her the arrears of her dowry-pension, and offering her the privilege of having all the wines required for her household free of duty or impost;[1] to grant Scotch merchants all the advantages formerly accorded to them by France; and to make her illegitimate brother, the Lord Robert Stuart, Captain of the Scotch Archer Guard, which post had, since the coolness between Catherine and Mary, been bestowed on a Frenchman. But neither these nor any other of Catherine's flattering offers could prevail with Mary to deviate from the sound policy of observing a strict neutrality in the contest between France and England. Her sympathies were probably with France; but she conformed her actions to the wishes of her subjects.[2] It was, however, impossible for her ever to do right in the eyes of the party whom she intended to please by this line of policy. Not only her most innocent actions, but things over which no mortal ever possessed the slightest control—

[1] January 15, 1563–4. State Paper MS., inedited.
[2] Keith. Tytler. State Paper MSS. of the year 1564—Scotch Correspondence.

such as the state of the weather, and the appearance of meteorological phenomena—were ingeniously turned to her reproach, as well as alleged marvels which never did occur. The philosophic reader of the present age of practical science can scarcely fail of being amused at the following record of the superstition, the ignorance, and prejudice of the sixteenth century, and the manner in which the passions of the uneducated were inflamed against Queen Mary by her eloquent adversary, John Knox:—

"God from heaven," he says, "and upon the face of the earth, gave declaration that he was offended at the iniquity that was committed, even within this realm; for upon the 20th day of January there fell wet in great abundance, which in the falling *freisit* (froze) so vehemently that the earth was but one sheet of ice. The fowls, both great and small, freisit, and might not flee. Many died; and some were taken and laid beside the fire, that their feathers might resolve.[1] And in that same month, the sea stood still, as was clearly observed, and neither ebbed nor flowed in the space of twenty-four hours. In the month of February, the 15th and 18th days thereof, was seen in the firmament battles arrayed, spears and other weapons, as it had been the joining of two armies. These things were not only observed, but also spoken and constantly affirmed by men of judgment and credit. But the Queen and our Court made merry, and there was banquetting on banquetting. The Queen would banquet all the Lords; and that was done upon policy, to remove the suspicion of her displeasure against them, because they would not, at her devotion, damn John Knox. To remove, we say, that jealousy, she made the banquet to the whole Lords, whereat she would have the Duke amongst the rest. It behoved them to banquet her again; and so did the banquetting continue till Fastren's Eve, and after. But the puir ministers were mockit, and reputed as monsters; and the guard and the officers of the kitchen were so griping, that the ministers' stipends could not be paid."[2]

The natural consequence of Mary's misjudging accept-

[1] Hist. Ref., vol. ii. p. 417. [2] Ibid.

ance of the thirds of the Church property was that every ill-paid and unpaid minister of the Reformed Congregation looked with natural indignation at the festivities of the Court, and, regarding the Queen as the cause of their own miseries, hurled at her those maledictions which ought rather to have been directed against the secularised priors, commendators, and abbots, together with the titled array of lay robbers who had possessed themselves of the lion's share of the spoil. The members of the Queen's Cabinet, though they were ostensibly the leaders of the Congregation, instead of pleading the cause of their spiritual pastors, were solicitors for their own selfish interests, and wheedled out of her the best of the Church lands that had been vested in the trusteeship of the Crown, for the support of their own ministers. The rich abbacy of Haddington, and all its fair domains, for instance, became the prey of the Secretary of State, William Maitland of Lethington.

The history of all religious revolutions will show that the possession of the temporalities is the great object of contention between the political leaders of the rival churches. The sincere desire of men of low degree for the light of truth, their honest zeal for the service of God, and the reformation of those abuses which corrupted the worship of the Middle Ages, were the weapons whereby the Lethingtons, Morays, Mortons, and other professing demagogues of the sixteenth century in Scotland, fought their way to power and the acquisition of Church lands which ought to have been appropriated to the maintenance of the working clergy, the support of schools, and the relief of the sick and destitute.

The festivities which moved the ire of Master John Knox took place just before Lent, always the close of the Court season in Edinburgh during the brief bright days of Mary Stuart's widow reign. Her entertainments in the February of 1564 were more than usually brilliant. "So soon as her Grace had recovered her health," writes Randolph, "she determined with herself to pass her time in mirth, and such pastimes as were most agreeable for that time approaching Shrovetide. Her Grace sent for the most part of her nobility to be here against Sunday last. She made

them so solemn a banquet that day as in Scotland, in the remembrance of man, except at the marriage of a prince, or the like, was not seen. Both the days following were little inferior to the first."[1] The object of these banquets was neither revelling nor idle dissipation, but the re-establishment of peace and good-will between lately discordant powers, on whose union the tranquillity of the realm depended. A political crisis of no ordinary interest had occurred. The deep-seeing Earl of Moray, having formed an accurate estimate of the popular influence of John Knox and the strength of his faction, had effected a reconciliation with him during the long dangerous illness of the Queen. Moray had united with Lethington, and Mary's other ministers, in the injudicious measure of taking her out of a bed of sickness, to expose her to the agitation of a personal discussion with the most ill-mannered person in her dominions, and then, instead of supporting her, had championised her adversary. The affront Mary had received from her Privy Council on that occasion was followed up by a formal requisition for her to abstain from practising the rites enjoined by the religion in which she had been nurtured. Mary, not considering the thorny diadem she wore worth the sacrifice of a compromise of conscience, offered to resign her office to Moray, and in the bitterness of her heart "commanded him to take the thankless burden on his own shoulders."[2] Such was, indeed, the desire of his soul, but the hour was not yet come for its accomplishment; the necessary arrangements had not been made. Queen Mary was the idol of her people; affection for her person, and veneration for her office, were united with respect for her virtues; she must be deprived of their love, and painted blacker than Messalina, ere another would be tolerated in her place. Moray rejected her offer of resigning it to him, and craved permission to retire to his estates in Fifeshire. Mary granted him leave of absence for eight days; he tarried twenty-one, during which time he incurred suspicion

[1] February 17, 1563–4. State Paper MS., inedited.
[2] Randolph's Letter to Cecil, February 21, 1564. State Paper Office MS., inedited.

by a meeting with his brother-in-law, the Earl of Argyll, at Castle Campbell. A report was next brought to the Queen that he had privily embarked from his own monastic port of Pittenweem for England, and this was at first believed both by her and others,[1] the conduct of Moray, previous to her return to Scotland, having been such as to justify any suspicions of treasonable correspondence between him and Queen Elizabeth. When Mary, however, was convinced that the rumour of his retreat to England was unfounded, a revulsion of feeling in his favour succeeded her late anger and mistrust. How could she doubt his loyalty and love to her, when he had refused to receive her demission of the crown of Scotland? Womanlike, she paused not to examine too closely into the motives of a negation which appeared so convincing a test of his honesty. But Moray knew full well his own position, and that if he would govern Scotland, it must be under the shadow of his Sovereign's sceptre; for how would the jealous Peers of Parliament, whom Mary called her cousins, being all more or less akin to the royal line, be persuaded to perform liege homage to her base-born brother? and Moray had, as yet, no infant puppet to call their monarch, as a cloak for his own usurpation of the regal office under the name of Regent. How often must the poor deluded Queen have marvelled at her own blindness and credulity, when retracing the progressive moves of her fraternal rival's finely played game.

True to her generous nature, Mary was the first to seek a reconciliation after the serious misunderstanding between herself and her brother in the commencement of the year 1564. Without waiting for him to make submissions and sue for pardon, she graciously extended the olive branch, and wooed him to leave his sullen retreat and resume his wonted place in her affections and her councils. As nothing more conducive to his own aggrandisement could then be effected, Moray accepted her invitation; and she honoured his return to her Court with fêtes and merry-makings, to which all her nobles were frankly bidden, whether they had

[1] Randolph's Letter to Cecil, Feb. 21, 1564. State Paper Office MS., inedited.

sided with her party or his faction during the late estrangement.

These political re-unions, without the hateful distinctions of creed or party—feasts of love and approximations to national concord and general good-will, where strife and all the deadly offices of cruel hatred had been expected—suited not the policy of the English Sovereign, and her secret-service men, whose peculiar study it was to deprive Mary of the confidence and affection of her subjects by infusing doubts as to the motives of her best and wisest actions. For this purpose the ready weapons of calumny and falsehood were employed, as Randolph exultingly boasts to Cecil, when reciting in Mephistophelian vein the working of these incendiary insinuations circulated by his own agents, for the purpose of poisoning the minds of the Protestant division of her nobles against their liberal-minded liege lady, at the very time she was endeavouring to obliterate the memory of bygone grudges, and seeking to draw all manly hearts to their loyal duty. But we must give the paragraph in the dry sarcastic words of our worthy diplomatist, who, after mentioning the reconciliation between the Queen and Moray, proceeds—

"The banquet ensueth hereupon. What devilish devices are imagined upon it passeth almost the mind of man to think: little good, some say, is intended to some or other. The banquets made by her mother a little before she went about to suppress God's word, made at that season of the year, are called to mind—this was the Shrovetide before the troubles. News herewith cometh that many sails of ships are coming out of France, to land in Scotland. This *brute* had almost *spylte* the whole pottage, confirming all the rest that no good was intended to poor Protestants, nor amity to be kept with England. To what end are all our banquets, for the space of twelve or fourteen days together? Every man his day about, and the Lord of Lid" (Lethington), "that excelled all other saving the Queen's. But while we pipe and dance our enemies shall land, and we have our throats cut. I was content to let this rumour run, so far as no suspicion could be gathered of this Queen that *I* was a

mover of it."[1] And if of such avowedly false witness against her as this, who shall believe his evidence on the more artfully contrived charges of which the plausible letters of this unscrupulous statesman are so often quoted as confirmatory?

"Would your Honour believe," he continues, in derision of the apprehensions he had excited by his fictions, "that there were any at this Shrovetide feast that thought they should have kept their Lent in Edinburgh Castle? What men suspected to have found amongst so many sweet banquetting dishes, I speak not; or what men remembered of like banquets, and what parts have been used at such times, it skilleth not how little is spoken, seeing in my conscience there was no such things thought of."[2] His description of the feast is quaint and characteristic, and, being from the pen of an eyewitness, a valuable record of the manners of the times. "The banquet continueth with great joy and mirth, marvellous sights, great shows, and singular devices; nothing undone that might either fill our bellies, feed our eyes, or content our minds. The Queen dined privately with the chief of the Lords and Ladies, where her Grace's will was that I should be placed at the Lords' table, so near that she might speak unto me, as she did much of the dinner-time. They that served her Grace were the four Maries. The Lords and Ladies were attended upon by the rest of her Grace's own gentlewomen and maidens, apparelled, as the other four, all in white and black, as she herself that dinner wore no other," being her widow colours, for still the beauteous Majesty of Scotland wore her *dule* weeds for the unforgotten husband of her youth. "The solemnities of the supper," proceeds Randolph, "are too long to describe, and, I trow, pass my wits to call them to mind. This I remember: three courses were brought in, in what strange order I let pass; but the last was served by gentlemen apparelled all in white and black, divers that could sing among them, who sang these verses which herewith I send your Honour. My Sovereign was drank unto openly; not one, of three hundred persons or mo, but heard

[1] Randolph to Cecil, Feb. 21, 1563–4. State Paper Office MS., inedited.
[2] Ibid.

the words spoken and saw the cups pass between" (Queen Mary and himself.) "This pleased well a good number to see these tokens of kindness towards the Queen's Majesty. I doubt not also but some were ready to burst for envy. This did wipe away the suspicion of evil-meaning. We departed all well pleased; but I, for my part, best contented to see so manifest tokens of love showed to my Sovereign in the face of so many as did behold it. I gave her Majesty thanks, in my Sovereign's name, in as good words as I could. She gave me answer, 'that it was more in heart than in outer show, and that shall these verses testify,' which she gave me in my hand, the self-same that were sung, and willed me to do with them as I liked, which I trust your Honour will present unto the Queen's Majesty, with my most humble suit of pardon that I write not unto her Highness's self."

From the explanatory notes which accompany these transcripts, we learn that, at the concluding supper in Holyrood, the figure of a blind Cupid was introduced with the first course, and placed on the royal table, while an Italian canzonette in his disparagement was sung by the attendants. A translation of the four commencing lines may serve as a specimen:—

> "And this is Love! the world doth call him so;
> Yet he is bitter, as thou seest, I trow;
> And at a future time shalt better see,
> When Love, who is our master, rules o'er thee."

A warning is added for the benefit of the unwary, "that he is the offspring of idleness and folly, a tyrant who slays many of his votaries, and makes others lead weary lives under the burden of sharp pangs and a thousand chains."[1]

With the second service a fair young maid was brought in, and Latin verses in praise of chastity, and describing the happiness in a future state of those who led unspotted lives of purity on earth, were sung. Lastly entered, with the third course, a young child in the character of Time; and the waiters sang a Latin ode describing the finite

[1] Keith.

nature of earthly things, of which the following is the sense:—

"Death, with arrows in his hands,
Revelling in poison, stands;
Time with scythe his harvest mows,
Who can strive against his blows?
Age and length of days in vain
Shall attempt to break the chain,
By unspotted faith entwined,
Not a link can they unbind.
Time and Age have buried low
Lelius and Scipio;
Yet the sacred memory
Of stainless faith and constancy
Shall 'scape oblivion's chilling breath,
And live untouched by age or death,
And unite the honoured names
Of the Britons' princely dames:
So, while heaven and earth endure,
Be Scotland's Queen to England's sure;
And England's cherish Scotland's Queen,
And linked with her in love be seen."[1]

These verses derive their chief interest from being the genuine compositions of Mary Stuart in Italian and Latin; not merely as specimens of the facility with which this accomplished Princess could write poetry in these languages, but as affording a clue to the real state of her mind on the subject of love, her preference of celibacy, her praise of chastity, and salutary remembrance of the inevitable power of death over human joys and glories. Not many royal beauties, in the flower of life and the pomp of greatness, would have been willing to be reminded of the finite nature of those distinctions; neither would Mary Stuart have cherished sentiments like these, if she had been the reckless votary of pleasure and passion represented by her modern French biographers.

But who that has not carefully studied the minutely circumstantial letters written by the accredited spy Randolph, for the information of his own Court, is aware that Mary Stuart's radiant smiles and sparkling wit concealed constitutional melancholy, and veiled the anguish of a heart that must have burst with overcharge of care and sense of

[1] Keith.

intolerable wrong, but for the floods of tears she shed in the retirement of her own chamber when alone with her attendant Maries, the loved companions of her childhood? It was from one of this fondly-trusted band, the giddy thoughtless Mary Beton, whom the guileful ambassador had entangled in the snares of his deceitful love, he obtained his secret information of all Queen Mary's most private affairs, with whom she corresponded—the solution of the ciphered passages in her uncle's letters, her words, her looks, her tears. Well was it for the young confiding Sovereign that there was nothing worse to betray—no act of sin or folly, no traits of anger, envy, malice, or unseemly vanity, nor aught that could in any way be chronicled to her reproach, or that could justify the oft-repeated but assuredly groundless charge of levity that has been brought against her.

No satisfactory effects resulted from Queen Mary's Shrove-tide feasts, because of the secret working of the malign insinuations of her sinister intentions towards some of her guests, artfully disseminated by Randolph, and encouraged by Moray's faction. The reconciliation between the latter and his royal sister, if sincere, was reported to be otherwise: he had assumed a defensive attitude, and intimated to his partisans an expectation of being arrested and committed to prison; while, on the other hand, a very uneasy apprehension was entertained by the nation, that the Queen, who had professed herself weary of the thankless responsibilities of her vocation, intended to withdraw to France or Lorraine, and abandon her Scotch subjects to their own devices. Her passionate offer of resigning the government to Moray had alarmed her people—and with reason, for the land had had peace under her gentle sway. She was the link that had drawn many fierce intractable elements of strife into harmony; and if she deserted them, what but discord and civil war between Moray, the Hamiltons, and the Lennox-Stuarts, ending in annexation of the realm to England, awaited them?[1] Evils worse than any that had befallen Scotland were to be expected, if their lawful ruler forsook

[1] Randolph to Cecil, Feb. 28, 1564. State Paper MS.

them in disgust. The anxious state of the public mind at that juncture, and the watchful attention paid to all Mary's movements, are thus described by Randolph: "Her Grace went upon Monday last to Dunbar—a few in company only, to pass her time. Immediately hereupon riseth the bruit 'that there were two ships that arrived there that night, and either that there was some nobleman come out of France, or that the Queen, taking a despite against this country, would again into France, and for that cause Martignes came to Calais to receive her, and the ships to convoy her.' To augment this suspicion, it was said that in the night there was conveyed out of the Abbey four great chests, and her Grace, being on horseback, should say unto my Lord Morton, 'God be with you, my Lord of Morton; I will bring you other *novelles* (tidings) when I come again.'[1]

"The next day cometh these news, that one of the two ships, that are laden with artillery to come into Scotland, was arrived at Dunbar, and the other was taken by the Englishmen. That night, being Wednesday, sudden warning was given to all my Lord of Moray's servants and friends in this town to ride out, and to lodge themselves in towns and houses about Dunbar, for that my Lord of Bothwell was come secretly to speak with the Queen, with many horses, and my Lord of Moray, being without any company, might perchance have fallen into some danger. The last news of all was, that my Lord of Moray was commanded to ward there."[2]

All these agitating rumours, commencing with the absurd tale that the French were coming to cut Protestant throats, were evidently so many attempts, on the part of her fraternal rival, to sound the tocsin of revolt against Queen Mary; but as no circumstances had then occurred, whereby a single action of hers could be twisted into a coincidence with the calumnies which at this period began to be systematically directed against her, the venomed shafts fell to the ground.

"With these news," continues Randolph, in reference to the above false reports, "there was one ready to have ridden away to my Lord of Argyll, of whose stay I think I was

[1] Randolph to Cecil, Feb. 28, 1564. State Paper MS., ined. [2] Ibid.

myself the occasion; and if I had been as hasty to believe as I was credibly informed, and earnestly advised and required from wise men to write away to your Honour"[1] (Cecil) "in time, I might by this time have put your Honour in great doubt of cumber here, and showed myself more hasty than wise. I took this resolution with myself, that if there had been appearance of the first bruit to have been true of the Queen's departure, or the last, which was my Lord of Moray's imprisonment, I would myself have gone to Dunbar to have been near her Grace, and have learned of herself what her meaning was. But finding, by diligent inquisition, not one of all these bruits to be true, I thought it best to seem as though I had never heard word of them."[2]

As Randolph, generally the fountain-head whence rumours of an injurious nature to Mary Stuart emanated, denies any implication in these last-recited fictions, the inference naturally suggests itself that they must have proceeded from Moray and his emissaries, for the purpose of ascertaining how far the people of Scotland stood disposed towards him, and whether an insurrectionary movement could be excited in his favour by the report of his arrest, coupled with the landing of the French to take possession of their old quarters, the strong fortress of Dunbar. Most important it is, in regard to the credibility of the atrocious charges brought against Mary Stuart, to trace the first steps of her adversaries in their progressive march of falsehood.

The real estimation in which Mary was held at this period, not only in Scotland, but throughout Europe, may be seen from the following testimony of that accomplished statesman, Michel Mauvissière de Castelnau, whose authority has generally been considered a very high one.[3] "When I arrived in Scotland," he says, "I found this Princess in

[1] Randolph to Cecil, Feb. 28, 1564. State Paper MS., ined. [2] Ibid.

[3] This nobleman visited her Court early in 1564, charged with letters to her from the young King and Queen-mother of France, touching the renewal of the ancient alliance between their realms; but his principal business was to ascertain whether she could be induced to accept a matrimonial proposal from her youthful brother-in-law, Henry, Duke of Anjou, afterwards Henry III. of France.

the flower of her age, esteemed and adored by her subjects, and in great request with all her neighbours, not merely on account of her elevated rank and connections, and prospect of being the successor of the Queen of England, but because she was endowed with greater charms and perfections than any other Princess of her times.[1] As I had the honour to be very well known to her, inasmuch as she had been our Queen, and I had been one of her own servants in France, and had accompanied her to Scotland, where I also returned the first to visit her on the part of the King Charles IX., and to bring her messages from the Guises, her relations, I had more access to her Majesty than those to whom she had been less accustomed. She told me of the suit that had been made to her by different Princes, naming the Archduke Charles, brother to the Emperor, several of the German Princes, and the Duke of Ferrara, adding that some of her subjects wished her to wed the Prince de Condé, now he was a widower, in preference to any of the others. 'This,' she observed, 'might be a means of uniting the house of Bourbon in a better understanding with that of Lorraine than had lately been the case, yet she felt no inclination to encourage his proposal. There was another match greater than any of these,' she said, 'of which overtures had been made to her—namely, Don Carlos, son of King Philip, and the successor to the throne of Spain.' Then I suggested how she might return to France by a marriage with the Duke of Anjou, brother to the King. She replied, 'that in truth no country in the world was so near to her heart as France, where she had been nurtured, and of which she had had the honour of sharing the throne; but she could not say she should like to return there in an inferior position to that she formerly occupied, and perhaps at the risk of losing her realm of Scotland, which had been greatly shaken, and her subjects much divided during her absence. If she could be sure,' she added, 'that the Prince of Spain would live to inherit all the dominions of his father, and would pass into Flanders, and follow up his proposal,

[1] In Jebb's Collection, vol. ii. p. 460.

she knew not what she might be induced to do in respect to him.'"[1]

The perfect indifference with which the beauteous Majesty of Scotland discusses her illustrious train of suitors, with her old servant, Michel de Castelnau, can scarcely fail to remind the readers of Shakspeare of Portia's comments on her catalogue of wooers.

Queen Elizabeth at length empowered Randolph to declare to Queen Mary, that the person whom she had selected for her consort was no other than her own favourite, Lord Robert Dudley. A burst of scornful indignation had evidently been anticipated by Randolph in reply to this announcement, which, to a Princess of Mary's high spirit, could not have been regarded in any other light than a studied insult. His own opinion of the proposal is briefly conveyed in these emphatic words, "She heard it with patience."[2] When her answer was required, she coldly said, "I must defer my resolution, being wholly taken by surprise."[3] He begged her to consider the necessity of coming to a speedy conclusion on a subject of such importance. "Your mistress," observed Mary, "hath been somewhat longer in deciding than I have been. She hath counselled me to have regard to three points in my choice, whereof the principal was honour. Now, think you, Master Randolph, it will be honourable in me to imbase my state by marrying her subject?"—"Yes," he replied, "for by means of him your Majesty is likely to inherit a kingdom."—"Where is my assurance of that?" asked Mary; "may not my sister marry, and have children herself? What, then, shall I have gotten by this marriage; and who will commend me if I enter into it on so sudden a proposal, without due conference? I would not willingly mistrust your mistress, but the adventure is too great. Is it conformable to her promise to use me as her sister or her daughter, and then marry me to her subject? although I hear well of the gentleman."[4] Randolph

[1] Memoirs de Castelnau—Jebb's Collection, vol. ii. p. 462.
[2] Letter from Randolph to Queen Elizabeth—Keith, 251.
[3] Randolph to Cecil, March 30—State Paper Office MS.
[4] Ibid.

enlarged on the advantages she might hope from such an alliance, and the assurance the offer bespoke of the affection of his royal mistress. "I take it rather as a proof of her good-will than her sincerity," was Mary's sharp rejoinder, "seeing she so much regardeth him herself that it is said she may not well spare him." Randolph entreated her to use the counsel of Lethington and Moray, of whose influence he was sure, in the matter. She did so the same evening after supper, and consented, without difficulty, to appoint a conference, to be held at Berwick, between Elizabeth's commissioners and her own, to consider the proposal.[1] Good hope of accomplishing the business was expressed by Randolph to Cecil. Mary humoured the farcical negotiations for her marriage with Elizabeth's Master of the Horse, calculating, by this policy, to obtain recognition as the lawful heiress to the crown of England, through Dudley's influence with Elizabeth. The Emperor was still a suitor for his son, the Archduke, with the offer of an increased revenue, in order to render him a more suitable match for the fair North British Sovereign. Mary, though she apparently never entertained a serious thought of the Austrian Prince, thought proper to indulge her curiosity, by employing Melville to obtain his portrait, and make minute inquiries as to his disposition, manners, and acquirements.[2] Meantime her aunt, the Duchess of Arschot, and Cardinal Grandeville continued their secret negotiations for her marriage with Don Carlos, the heir of Spain.[3]

The announcement of the almost incredible fact, that a treaty had been opened for a marriage between Lord Robert Dudley and the Queen of Scots, was followed by a private mission from the Countess of Lennox, for the purpose of offering her eldest son, Lord Darnley, in marriage to his royal cousin—a consort in every way better qualified to aspire to her hand than the *parvenu* favourite of the Queen of England, being the eldest male descendant from

[1] Randolph to Cecil, March 30—State Paper Office MS.
[2] Melville's Memoirs.
[3] See the Correspondence in Labanoff, vol. i.

the royal house of Tudor on his mother's side, and claiming on the paternal line the like distinction, as the next legitimate Prince of the royal family of Scotland, with the prospect of continuing, by a marriage with the Sovereign of that realm, the name of Stuart, then so dear to the Scotch. He had been educated by his mother in the tenets of the Church of Rome, was handsome, learned, and accomplished, and excelled in all the courtly exercises of the age. Mary herself declares "that this proposal was only the renewal of a suit which had been previously made to her, in behalf of her young kinsman, by her aunt of Lennox, and which, for the above reasons, she considered herself bound to entertain favourably; and, that she was strenuously urged to accept it by the Earl of Atholl, Lord Lindsay, all the Stuarts, and all her Catholic subjects."[1] The young Queen wished to keep her intentions on this subject a profound secret for the present; yet Randolph, the very day on which she received from Lady Lennox the renewed offer of Darnley's hand, writes to Cecil: "I understand from one near the Queen that in this business she will cast anchor between Dover and Berwick, though, perchance, not in the port we wish for."[2] This oracular intimation, that Mary would take an English husband, but not the one proposed to her by Elizabeth, was obtained, of course, from her faithless confidante, Mary Beton, to whom the agent of Elizabeth paid deceitful courtship, for the purpose of extracting intelligence.

From the date of her letters, it appears that Mary visited Lochleven this spring, and spent several weeks at Perth. It was there that she received Sir James Melville on his return from England, May 5, and heard from him that the new Emperor, Maximilian, intended to prevent her marriage, either with his brother, the Archduke, or Don Carlos of Spain, as contrary to his own interests; also, that Elizabeth had made overtures for a renewal of a matrimonial treaty with the said Archduke, whom she had so earnestly dissuaded her from marrying. Mary was indignant at having been rendered the dupe of an artful rival in this

[1] Labanoff, p. 227. [2] Randolph to Cecil, April 14—Keith.

matter; for, notwithstanding her utter indifference, not only to the Archduke Charles, but to matrimony altogether, she liked not to have been outwitted. From this time, Melville tells us, "she put the marriage with that Prince clean out of her head."[1] She asked Melville, who was then only a visitor at her Court, to relinquish the service of his foreign master, the Prince Palatine, for hers. He was loth to lose the offers of preferment that had been made to him in France and elsewhere. "But," observes he, "the Queen, my Sovereign, was so instant, and so well inclined, and showed herself endued with so many princely virtues, that I thought it would be against good conscience to leave her, requiring so earnestly my help and service to draw home again, aye more and more, the hearts of her subjects that had strayed, and were grown cold, during the late troubles, the while she was absent in France, and were joined in a great friendship with England. Then she was so affable, so gracious and discreet, that she won great estimation; so that I thought her more worthy to be served for little profit, than any other Prince in Europe for great commodity. Then she was naturally liberal, more than she had means; for not only she provided me with a pension of a thousand marks, one part of the same to be taken out of her dowry in France, but she would have given me in heritage the lands of Auchtermuchty, beside Falkland; which I refused, 'alleging the same to be nearest part of her property, which she might not well want.' But another, hearing that she was so well-hearted, sought it, and got it."[2]

Poor Mary improved the brief intervals she had of cessation from civil strife, by indefatigable endeavours to induce her people to adopt the best usages of civilisation. Good roads, she saw, were among these: in the place of the trenches of mud, called roads, by which her capital was entered, she had regular paved ones, with causeways, made diverging in various directions from the gates of Holyrood.[3] That called the "Fishwives' Causeway,"

[1] Sir James Melville's Memoirs—Bannatyne Club edit., pp. 110, 111.
[2] This was Mary Livingstone.
[3] Statistical History of Scotland, vol. i. p 389.

running as far as Duddingston, has been taken for a Roman road; but the tradition of the people, faithful to the founder of the benefit, pertinaciously attributes it to her; and, moreover, links her name to every good road near her residences. She wished to make them like the paved highways of France. If she granted privileges to burghs, she bound the burghers to make and keep up good roads, instances of which are quoted in the charters of Linlithgow and Peebles; likewise she gave grants to private individuals, on the condition of keeping up certain roads and paths.[1]

At the Assembly of the Church, which took place June 25th, 1564, Lethington, who continued a nominal adherent of the Congregation, remonstrated with Knox for calling the Queen from the pulpit "a slave of Satan," and affirming "that God's vengeance hung over the realm on account of her impiety in continuing to practise the rites of her own religion." The loyal part of the Assembly declared "that such violence of language could never profit;" and the Master of Maxwell, who was a sincere reformed Christian, said in plain words, "If I were in the Queen's Majesty's place, I would not suffer such things as I hear." Knox defended himself from the implied charge of intolerance in these words: "The most vehement, and, as ye speak, excessive manner of prayer I use in public is this: 'O Lord, if thy pleasure be, purge the heart of the Queen's Majesty from the venom of idolatry, and deliver her from the bondage of Satan, in the which she hath been brought up, and yet remains, for lack of true doctrine,'" &c.[2] Lethington asked him "where he found the example of such prayer as that?" Knox replied in the words, "'Thy will be done,' in the Lord's Prayer,"—a strange perversion of the divine spirit of that most pure and perfect form of prayer. Lethington told him "he was raising doubts of the Queen's conversion." "Not I, my Lord," replied Knox, "but her own obstinate rebellion."—"Wherein rebels she against God?" asked Lethington. "In every action of her life," retorted Knox,

[1] Statistical History of Scotland, vol. i. p. 389.
[2] See the whole in Knox, Hist. Ref. Scot., vol. ii. p. 428.

" but in these two heads especially—that she will not hear the preaching of the blessed evangile of Jesus Christ; and, secondly, that she maintains that idol, the mass."—" She thinks not that rebellion, but good religion," replied Lethington. This was the simple fact as regarded Mary's unpopular and impolitic adhesion to the faith in which she had, unfortunately for herself, been educated; and that she did so against her worldly interests ought not to be imputed to her as a crime. " Why say ye that she refuses admonition?" asked Lethington; " she will gladly hear any man." —" When will she be seen to give her presence to the public preachings?" asked Knox. "I think never," replied Lethington, " as long as she is thus entreated." A lengthened disputation followed, on the question whether the Queen should be still permitted to enjoy the liberty of her private worship, against which Knox strenuously protested. The Assembly, being much divided in opinion, desired to refer the decision to Calvin; but as Knox objected to that manner of settling the dispute, the Assembly broke up unresolved.[1]

Mary returned to her metropolis in the beginning of June, and having transacted her business for the season, departed with her retinue, July 22d, for the Highlands, having determined to make a progress to the most northerly point of her dominions. She had the good policy to visit in turn every district in Scotland, by which she made herself thoroughly acquainted with the condition of her people, and rendered herself admired and beloved wherever she came. She was present at the great huntings in Atholl, where two thousand Highlanders had previously been employed to sweep the game from the woods and mountains about Atholl, Badenoch, Mar, and Moray. Mary entered into the sport with great zest, and enjoyed the satisfaction of being in at the death of five wolves, the last survivors of the salvage beasts which once formed the terror of the shepherds and lassies in those wild districts. No less than three hundred and thirty-six deer were slain in the course of this royal hunt.[2] Hawks were brought to her

[1] Knox, Hist. Ref., vol. ii. p. 461.
[2] Barclay's History of Caledonian Hunts.

Majesty from the Isle of Skye, and those who presented this acceptable offering were well rewarded.[1] Mary's occupations were not confined to sylvan sports. She held justice courts; she made her advocate for the poor perform his duty, by pleading for those who suffered wrong and could not afford to seek redress. She gave receptions to the ladies in those remote districts, who were unable to undertake a journey to Edinburgh to pay their homage to her in Holyrood; and she proclaimed a music-meeting, offering her own favourite harp as the prize of the best performer. The fair Beatrice Gardyn, of Banchory, in Aberdeenshire, was adjudged by her Majesty to have surpassed all the courtly competitors, and even her own musicians, in skill and taste, as well as in the sweetness of her voice. Neither Michelet, Mary's newly-imported French musician, nor even her old-established favourite, David Riccio, were excepted. The poet-queen acknowledged the superiority of the native melodies of Scotland to the most elaborate harmonies which foreign science could produce; and when she felt the soul-thrilling power of a Scottish ballad, from the lips of a sweet-voiced Scottish lassie, the generous Sovereign hailed her young subject as the Queen of Song, and accorded the harp to her, with this compliment, "You alone are worthy to possess the instrument you touch so well."[2] Queen Mary's harp is still preserved by the descendants of Beatrice Gardyn, at Ludc. It was originally graced with a portrait of the royal donor, and the arms of Scotland in solid gold, enriched with several gems, two of which were considered of great value; but these were stolen during the civil wars.[3]

[1] Household Book, cited by Chalmers

[2] Gun's Historical Enquiry respecting the Performance of the Harp. A drawing of the harp given by Queen Mary to Beatrice Gardyn has been published in the above work. It is on this incident that Hogg has founded his charming poem, "The Queen's Wake," only he imagined that the music-meeting at which the harp was won was held at Holyrood.

[3] Queen Mary's harp was strung anew, tuned, and played on, in the year 1806. A lady of the family of Gardyn of Banchory, subsequently of Troup, having married a descendant of Robertson of Lude, transferred the relic thither. It is somewhat smaller than the Caledonian harp, and is adapted for twenty-eight strings, the longest twenty-four inches, the shortest two and a half. This instrument had been for centuries in the Lude family; and is now in the possession of Stuart of Dalguise, Perthshire.—*Dalzel on Music.*

While Mary was thus endearing herself to the hearts of her subjects in the far north, the negotiations for her marriage with Lord Robert Dudley proceeded tardily. The improbability of their being ever brought to a favourable conclusion was acknowledged even by Randolph, from whom the lofty courtesy and politic forbearance of the royal beauty had not been able to veil her disdain of so unworthy a mate; neither was it believed that Elizabeth would resign her favourite to any other woman. Randolph actually took the liberty of inquiring of his enamoured Sovereign, in plain English, by desire of his Scotch confederates in Mary's Cabinet, "whether, in case the Queen of Scotland could be induced to receive the Lord Robert for her consort, her Majesty meant not to consider such acquiescence a sufficient warrant for marrying him herself"?[1]

The answer was probably not given in black and white, for it is not on record, and Elizabeth's conduct and motives remain among the unsolved enigmas of history. Was it for the purpose of qualifying her favourite to demand her own hand, as King-matrimonial of Scotland and the widower of Mary Stuart, that the royal spinster of England bestowed so much time and trouble in endeavouring to accomplish this preposterous marriage, or merely an attempt to reduce the unconquerable realm of Scotland into a vassal kingdom under her minion?

It was during the perplexities and apprehensions that beset her, in consequence of Elizabeth's complicated intrigues for forcing her into wedlock with Lord Robert Dudley, that Mary Stuart took a decisive step towards her own most fatal marriage, by consenting to recall the Earl of Lennox into Scotland.[2] The political jealousy of Elizabeth was excited at this move, and she wrote to Mary, desiring her to rescind her permission for the return of this nobleman, who was now an English subject. Mary used some expressions in her reply which were highly resented by Elizabeth, and a coolness ensued between the two Queens, so that they ceased to correspond in the

[1] Randolph to Queen Elizabeth—printed in Keith, 260.
[2] Keith. Tytler.

amicable manner they had previously done.[1] The publication of the celebrated book by Hales, the Clerk of the Hanaper, setting forth the claims of Lady Katherine Gray and her sons to the regal succession of England, in preference to those of the Queen of Scots, made some sensation at this crisis.[2] The assertion that no stranger, or person born out of England, could legally succeed to the crown of that realm, though it might have been triumphantly met by several historical precedents to the contrary, gave Mary much uneasiness, and the more easily inclined her to listen to the renewed entreaties of her aunt, Lady Lennox, for her to accept young Henry, Lord Darnley, the eldest English-born male descendant of the royal house of Tudor, for her consort, and thus unite their claims. Mary's secret inclination to marry Darnley was so thoroughly concealed by her apparent desire to wed the heir of Spain, and the continuation of the correspondence in that quarter, that Elizabeth, for the purpose of diverting her from entering into that alliance, not only granted Lennox permission to proceed to Edinburgh, but furnished him with credentials and a letter to Mary, interceding with her for the reversal of his forfaulture, and the restoration of his estates.[3] Lennox, after an exile of twenty years, arrived in Edinburgh early in September 1564, and as the Queen was not yet returned from her northern progress, accepted in the interim an invitation to visit the Earl of Atholl.

Mary was at Dundee September 9, as she dates from that place a short letter to the Duke of Savoy, whom, as the consort of Margaret of Valois, aunt to her deceased husband, Francis II., she addresses as "*mon oncle.*"[4] As soon as she heard of the arrival of the Earl of Lennox, she returned to Holyrood, and qualified him to appear in her presence by a process, which is thus quaintly recorded: "On the 22d day of September, Mathew, some time Earl of Lennox, was, by open proclamation at the Mercat Cross of Edinburgh, relaxed fra the process of our Sovereign Lady's horn by Sir

[1] Sir James Melville's Memoirs.
[2] Wright's Elizabeth. Cecil's Letters. Keith.
[3] This is certified by Mary's letter to Elizabeth, in Labanoff, vol. i. p. 235.
[4] Diurnal of Occurrents.

Robert Forman of Luthrie, knight, Lion-King of Arms, and all the officers, delivering the wand of peace to John, Earl of Atholl, who received the same in the said Earl's name."[1] The next day Lennox rode in state to the abbey of Holyrood, preceded by twelve gentlemen clothed in velvet coats, with chains about their necks, upon fair horses; and behind him thirty other gentlemen well mounted, wearing grey livery coats, and entered the lodging, which had been most honourably prepared for him, in the house of Mary's brother, the Lord Robert, Commendator of Holyrood, beside the said abbey.[2] The Queen, who was holding an especial Court for this purpose, sent a formal requisition for his attendance by a deputation of her officers of state, by whom he was conducted into her presence. She received him with the testimonials of affection and respect due to the husband of her father's sister, the kiss and embrace of welcome, displeasing as it was to many of the nobles in the courtly circle to see such demonstrations bestowed by their Sovereign Lady on the traitor who had sold her and her realm, in her helpless infancy, for English gold. The Duke of Châtelherault, finding his ancient foe, his rival in the regal succession, and the sworn opposer of his legitimacy, brought back on the political arena, after twenty years of well-deserved outlawry, believed the ruin of his house, so long decreed by the Earl of Moray, was now to be accomplished in good earnest.

Fears having been expressed to Cecil by some of the Protestants that the cause of religion might suffer from the return of Lennox, whose conscience was entirely political, Moray wrote an assurance of the groundlessness of such an alarm: "seeing," observes he emphatically, "we have the favour of our Prince (Queen Mary), and liberty of our conscience in such abundance as our hearts can wish."[3] Lennox endeavoured to prove his attachment to the faith by act of Parliament established in Scotland, by the easy test of frequenting the preachings. "His Lordship's cheer

[1] Diurnal of Occurrents. [2] Ibid.
[3] Moray to Cecil—State Paper Office MS.

is great," writes Randolph,[1] "and his household many, though he hath despatched divers of his train away. He findeth occasion to disburse money very fast, and of his seven hundred pounds brought with him, I am sure that much is not left. If he tarry long, Lennox may perchance be to him a dear purchase. He gave the Queen a marvellous fair and rich jewel, whereof there is made no small account; a clock and a dial, curiously wrought and set with stones; and a looking-glass, very richly set with stones in the four metals: to my Lord of Lethington, a very fair diamond in a ring; to my Lord of Atholl another, as also somewhat to his wife—I know not what; to divers others somewhat, but to my Lord of Moray nothing. He presented also each of the Maries such pretty things as he thought fittest for them. Such good means he hath to win their hearts, and make his way to farther effect. The bruit is here that my lady herself and my Lord Darnley are coming after, and some have asked me if she were not on the way. This I find, that there is here marvellous good liking of the young Lord, and that many desire to have him here." Among these was not Mary's Lord Chancellor, Morton, who beheld with alarm the prospect of the representatives of his uncle Angus coming to claim the mighty inheritance of which he was the acting manager for his nephew and ward, the present possessor. At first the Duke of Châtelherault refused to meet Lennox, except in the presence of the Queen, and there they were only restrained from acts of open violence by her authority. On the 27th of October, however, the "Diurnal of Occurrents" records the fact that these two noblemen "were finally agreed, in our Sovereign Lady's palace of Holyrood House, by our Sovereign Lady and the Lords of her Secret Council, and shook hands together, and drank every one to other." There was no such thing as making up a quarrel in Scotland without drowning it in the bowl; but this was not so easily quenched, for within the week the Queen had to interpose again between the belligerent parties, by commanding them to refrain from aggravating

[1] Randolph to Cecil, Oct. 24—State Paper MS.

language towards each other, assuring them "that she would take part against the one who should presume to enter first into a fresh strife." The Duke vehemently opposed the restoration of Lennox's estates, which had been forfeited during his regency in 1545, declaring "that the loss of these was less punishment than the treasons of the Earl had merited," and predicted "that his return would be followed by evil consequences both to the Queen and her realm." But Mary, whose policy was to convert foes into friends by her benefits, convened a Parliament for the especial purpose of Lennox's restoration to his honours and estates, December 6th. On passing from the Abbey to the Tolbooth to open it, the Earl of Moray bore the crown before her, as the Duke of Châtelherault refused to be present; the Earl of Atholl the sceptre, and the Earl of Crawford the sword of state. The Queen made a speech from the throne, declaring her gracious purpose, and explained "that she was the more disposed to exercise her clemency in this matter, because of the solicitations of the Queen of England in his behalf." Her Majesty's address to her Three Estates was seconded in a very eloquent speech by her Secretary of State, Lethington, who set forth the descent of Lennox from the royal house, and his affinity to the Queen by his marriage with her aunt; laid some stress on the policy of attending to the recommendation of the Queen of England; and above all, the natural inclination of their Sovereign to pity the decay of noble houses; "who, as we have heard from her own report," continued he, "has a great deal more pleasure to be the instrument of the uphold, maintenance, and advancement of the ancient blood, than to have matter ministered of the decay or overthrow of any good race." And here it is impossible to refrain from quoting the following fine specimen of the rhetoric of a Scottish statesman of the sixteenth century, including, as it does, a testimony of Mary Stuart's character, and the beneficial effects which had resulted from her government; the more striking because proceeding from the lips of one of the associate traitors who, a few brief months later, endeavoured to justify their ill-treatment of her by

describing her as a fiend in human shape. "I would extend the circumstances more largely," he observes, "if I feared not to offend her Highness, whose presence and modest nature abhors adulation, and so will compel me to speak such things as may tend to any good and perfect point; but lest it should be counted to me as that I were oblivious, if I should omit to put you in remembrance in what part we may accept this and the like demonstrations of her gentle nature, whose gracious behaviour towards all her subjects in general may serve for a good proof of that felicity we may look for under her happy government, so long as it shall please God to grant her unto us. For a good harmony to be had in the commonweal, the offices between the Prince and the subjects must be reciprocal. As by her Majesty's prudence we enjoy this present peace with all foreign nations, and quietness among yourselves in such sort as, I think, justly it may be affirmed, Scotland in no man's age that presently lives was in greater tranquillity, so it is the duty of all us, her loving subjects, to acknowledge the same as a most high benefit proceeding from the good government of her Majesty, declaring ourselves thankful and rendering to her Majesty such due obedience as a just Prince may look for at the hands of faithful and obedient subjects. I mean no forced nor unwilling obedience, which I know her nature does detest; but such as proceeds from the contemplation of her modest regiment (rule) will, for love and duty sake, produce the fruits thereof. A good proof have we all in general had of her Majesty's benignity, these three years that she has lived in the government over you; and many of you have largely tasted of her large dealing, and frank dealing—the many notable examples of her clemency above others her good qualities, which," he winds up all by observing, "ought to move them to abhor and detest all false bruites and rumours, (which are the most pestilent evils than can be in any commonweal), and the inventers and sowers thereof."[1]

No dissentient voice was uplifted in the Senate against this appeal for grateful acknowledgment of the blessings

[1] Robertson's Appendix.

whereof the lately divided realm of Scotland had been rendered recipient by Mary's gentle sway. When she rode again to the Tolbooth, to give her regal sanction to the acts which restored Lennox to the rights and privileges his treasons had forfeited, the Duke of Châtelherault was induced to resume his place in the regal procession, and to bear the crown before her Majesty, lest, by his absence, the claims of his rival to that honour should have been recognised.

MARY STUART

CHAPTER XV.

SUMMARY

Dissension between Queen Mary and Elizabeth — Mary sends Melville to inquire the cause—Elizabeth objects to Mary's despiteful letter—Melville's adroit flattery—Elizabeth wants to be thought prettier than Mary—Absence of personal vanity in Mary—Lord Robert Dudley made Earl of Leicester—Elizabeth accuses Mary of treating him with scorn—Mary denies the charge—Prince de Condé offers his hand to Mary—Her letter to her aunt, the Duchess of Arschot, on her matrimonial affairs—Mary urged to marry a Prince of France—She refuses the Count-Dauphin of Auvergne—Her favour to the Earl of Lennox—Dances with him—Declares her intention to marry soon—She leaves Edinburgh—Her preference of St Andrews—Her blithe abode in the merchant's house — Lively conversations with Randolph — Darnley arrives in Scotland — Mary receives him at Wemyss Castle — His reception—Queen and he detained by bad weather—They separate.

WHILE Queen Mary had been demonstrating her sisterly desire to oblige Queen Elizabeth, by restoring the Earl of Lennox to his paternal honours and estates, Elizabeth was raging at the favour with which he had been treated by his native Sovereign out of respect to her letter of recommendation, that credential having been the more particularly dwelt upon by Mary in her public proceedings, because it had been preceded by an unfriendly correspondence between her and the English Queen. As it was Mary's earnest desire to preserve amicable relations between herself and Elizabeth, she despatched that adroit courtier, Sir James Melville, to inquire into the cause of her displeasure, offer any explanations and apologies that might be deemed necessary, and endeavour, by every means, to effect a reconciliation,[1] and also

[1] Sir James Melville's Memoirs.

to come to a private understanding with Lord Robert Dudley. When Melville arrived in London, he received especial marks of attention from Lord Robert, who sent his servant with a horse and foot-mantle passamented with gold, for his use during his sojourn at the English Court. Melville's first presentation to Queen Elizabeth took place in the garden of her palace, where she was walking. She expressed herself with great warmth on the subject of "the despiteful letter the Queen of Scots," she said, "had written to her," and declared "she would never write to her again, unless it were a letter to the full as despiteful." Indeed, she had one ready written, "which," says Melville, "she took out of her pouch to let me see, but added, that the reason she had not sent it was because it was too gentle; so she delayed till she could write another more vehement, in answer to the Queen of Scots' angry *bill*" — the word bill being a contraction of billet. Then she showed Melville Mary's letter, which she had ready in her hand; and he, having read it, could not discover any cause of offence therein, and adroitly imputed its being misunderstood to certain idiomatic delicacies in the French language. "For although," he said, "her Majesty of England could speak as good French as any one who had *never* been in France, yet she lacked the use of the French Court language, which was frank and short, and had ofttimes two significations, which discreet and familiar friends always took in the best sense! He therefore entreated her to tear the despiteful letter she had been preparing to send in revenge to his Queen, and he would never let her know that her true plain meaning had been so strangely misconstrued."[1] The mighty Elizabeth was confounded at the intimation that she had convicted herself of not understanding polite French as well as she fancied she did; and having, peradventure, a salutary dread of the ridicule that might be thrown upon her in consequence, she said, "that as the Queen of Scots had made the first overture towards a reconciliation, she ought not to remain in wrath," tore both the letter Mary had written to her and her reply; and, changing the conversation,

[1] Sir James Melville's Memoirs.

asked "if the Queen of Scots had sent any answer to the proposition of marriage made to her by Randolph?" Melville answered as he had been instructed, "that his Queen thought little or nothing of the matter, but looked for the meeting of the commissioners on the Borders, to confer on various matters of importance to the quiet of both realms; that she thought of sending the Earl of Moray and Secretary Lethington on her part, and was in hope that her Majesty would soon fulfil her promise of sending the Earl of Bedford and Lord Robert Dudley."[1] Elizabeth observed "that Melville appeared to make small account of my Lord Robert, by naming the Earl of Bedford before him, but ere it were long she would make him a greater Earl, and that Melville should see it done before his returning home; for she esteemed the Lord Robert as her brother and best friend, whom she would have married herself if she had been minded to take a husband; but being determined to end her days in virginity, she wished that the Queen her sister should marry him, as meetest of all other, and with whom she might rather find it in her heart to declare her next in succession to her realm than with any other person; for, being matched with him, she would not then fear any attempts at usurpation during her own life."[2] "To make my mistress think the more of him," continues Melville, "I was required to stay till I had seen him made Earl of Leicester and Baron of Denbigh, with great solemnity, at Westminster, herself helping to put on his ceremonials, he sitting on his knees before her, keeping a great gravity and discreet behaviour; but she could not refrain from putting her hand in his neck to *kittle* him, smilingly, the French ambassador and I standing beside her. Then she asked 'how I liked him?' I said, 'as he was a worthy subject, he was happy in a Princess that could discern and reward merit.' 'Yet,' said she, 'ye like better of yonder lang lad," pointing towards my Lord Darnley, who, as nearest Prince of the blood, bore the sword of honour that day before her. My answer was, 'that no woman of spirit would make choice of such a man, that was liker a woman

[1] Sir James Melville's Memoirs, p. 119. [2] Ibid.

than a man, for he was lovely, beardless, and ladyfaced.' I had no will she should think that I liked him, or had any eye that way." Elizabeth professed to Melville much affection to his royal mistress, and a great desire to see her, and often looked upon her picture, which she kissed. She showed him also a fair ruby, as large as a racket-ball. He asked her to send it to his Queen as a token, or else my Lord of Leicester's picture. She said, "If the Queen would follow her counsel, she would get both in time, and all that she had, but she would send her a diamond by him." She asked "whether her hair or Queen Mary's was the best, and which of the two was the fairest?" He answered, "that the fairness of both was not their worst fault."[1] She was earnest that he should tell her decidedly. "I told her," observes Melville, "'she was the fairest Queen in England, and ours the fairest Queen in Scotland.' Yet she was earnest. I said 'they were the fairest ladies in their Courts, and that the Queen of England was whiter, but our Queen was very *lusome.*' Elizabeth inquired 'which of them was of the highest stature.' I said 'our Queen.' 'Then she is over high,' was Elizabeth's remark, 'for that she was herself neither over high nor over low.'"

The greatest enemies of Mary have never been able to cite a single trait of personal vanity on her part, much less of self-praise. It was impossible for her to be unconscious of those charms which had been celebrated by all the poets of France and Scotland, and which excited spontaneous exclamations of "God's blessings on that sweet face!" wherever she appeared; but she was satisfied with unsought homage, and possessed too much dignity to challenge compliments from the lips of the representatives of other Princes.

Elizabeth inquired what exercises Mary used; Melville replied, "that when he was despatched out of Scotland, she had but newly returned from the Highland hunting; that when she had leisure from the affairs of her country, she read in good books the histories of divers countries, and sometimes played on the lute and virginals." Elizabeth

[1] Sir James Melville's Memoirs.

asked if she played well. "Reasonably well for a Queen," was the reply. Elizabeth took care that he should have opportunity of hearing her own performance next day, and inquired which was the best performer, herself or his mistress. "In that," says he, "I gave her the praise." She detained Melville two days that he might see her dance, and then demanded whether she or his Queen danced the best. He replied, "that his Queen danced not so high and disposedly as she did." The overweening vanity of Elizabeth probably inclined her to take this answer as a delicate mode of assigning the superiority to her. The next day Leicester requested Melville to sail with him in his barge from Hampton Court to London, and this for the purpose of inquiring how Queen Mary stood affected towards the marriage with him which Master Randolph had proposed. "Whereunto," says Melville, "I answered very coldly, as I was by the Queen commanded. Then he began to *purge* [exonerate] himself of so proud pretence to marry so great a Queen, esteeming himself not worthy to dight her *schoone* [shoes]; alleging the invention of that proposition to have proceeded of Master Cecil, his secret enemy; 'For if I should,' said he, 'have seemed to desire that marriage, I should have lost the favour of both Queens,' praying me to excuse him unto my Queen, that it would please her Majesty not to impute that fault unto him, but unto the malice of his enemies."[1]

Leicester certainly had no great inclination to be played off as a puppet in this intrigue, and was apparently anxious to come to a private understanding on the subject with Mary, before he committed himself either way in so delicate an affair.

Melville, on his return to Scotland, brought presents from Lady Lennox to Mary and all her ministers; a splendid diamond, in particular, to purchase the good-will of Moray to the coming of her son, young Darnley. Melville had been charged with messages of loyal affection to his Queen from numerous persons of consequence in England—Protestants as well as professors of her own religion. He had con-

[1] Melville's Memoirs.

ferred with the Spanish ambassador, and received assurances that both Philip and Don Carlos were well disposed towards the long-projected matrimonial alliance with her, but that the misunderstanding which had broken out between the royal sire and son was likely to delay the treaty. The peculiar disposition of Don Carlos, and his constitutional malady, were sufficient objections to a marriage with him, under the most favourable circumstances; and Mary had certainly resigned all intention of wedlock in that quarter, from the time she sent for the father of her cousin Darnley to her Court.

She inquired of Melville whether he thought the Queen of England meant truly towards her, as well inwardly in her heart as she appeared to do outwardly by her speech. His reply was, "In my judgment there was neither plain-dealing nor upright meaning, but great dissimulation, emulation, and fear, that your princely qualities should overshine, chase her out, and displace her from her kingdom, as having already hindered the marriage with the Archduke Charles of Austria, and now offering my Lord of Leicester, whom she would herself be loth to want." "Then the Queen," continues Melville, "gave me her hand that she would never marry the new-made Earl."[1]

Scarcely had the adroit Melville succeeded in restoring a good understanding between the two Queens, when Elizabeth took up a new cause of offence, on a report which had been sent to her from France of the contempt with which Mary had treated the offer she had made her of her own favourite. The circumstance is mentioned by Mary herself, in a letter to Beton, Archbishop of Glasgow, her minister at the Court of France, after mentioning the return of Melville, "whom," she says, "I sent to the Queen, my good sister, with an apology for some letters of mine which she thought somewhat rude, but has taken the interpretation he put upon them in good part; she has since sent to me by Randolph, who is now here, some very polite letters written with her own hand, containing fair words, and some complaints that the Queen (Regent of France) and her ambas-

[1] Melville's Memoirs.

sador had assured her that I had published in mockery the overtures she had made for my marriage with the Lord Robert. I cannot imagine that any one there would wish to embroil me so much with her, since I have neither spoken of it to any one, nor written of it even to the Queen (of France), who, I am sure, would not have borne such testimony against me."[1] It was difficult to persuade Elizabeth that Mary had not expressed to her friends and kindred in France, any portion of the derision with which her keen sense of the ridiculous compelled her to regard this offer, under all the circumstances. Mary had been observed to laugh much for several days after the proposal was made, without affording any reasonable explanation of her mirth; and Elizabeth, having reason to remember how unpleasantly scandal had connected her own name with the man whom she had offered to Mary, probably imputed the risibility of that Princess to no other cause. In the following interesting letter to her aunt, the Duchess of Arschot, Mary alludes in a very guarded and delicate manner to this curious matrimonial proposal, after mentioning the renewed suit of her passionate admirer, the Prince of Condé:—

"MARIE STUART TO THE DUCHESS OF ARSCHOT.

"MY AUNT,—Having heard that the ship sails to-morrow for Flanders, I would not allow it to go without sending you a word just to recall me to your good grace, and also to apprise you that I had news from France the day before yesterday, by one of my people, whom the Bishop of Glasgow, my ambassador, has despatched to me. Among other things of which I am informed, I hear that the Prince de Condé has asked me in marriage of Madame my grandmother, and of Monsieur the Cardinal, my uncle, to whom he has made the finest offers in the world, as regards religion as well as other things; and above all, he will give his children as hostages that he will assure me and mine from all foes, whom he will leave to justice. In order to conclude the matter, he offers to send to me a gentleman of this country well versed in all intrigues, whom he is assured can work so well with these nobles here that they will entreat me to enter into the affair. My neighbours solicit me for another matter, for which I have no great inclination; but I have been desirous to let you know about it, that I may be advised what answer to give. As to the rest, the Constable has informed my people of the marriage of him of whom you wot, [Charles IX.], and others also, with the eldest daughter of the newly elect [Emperor, Maximilian II.]

"This is all I can tell you without cipher; but if I had your news, I

[1] Prince Labanoff, Recueil des Lettres de Marie Stuart, vol. i. p. 243.

could write more fully. In the mean time, I pray you to assure yourself of me as the most affectionate relation and friend you have. And here I will kiss your hands with hearty good-will in conclusion; and I beseech God to give you, my Aunt, in health, a very happy and long life.

"From Edinburgh, 6th November, 1564."

Endorsed, "A Madame la Duchesse d'Arschot."[1]

The commissioners appointed by the two Queens for negotiating the conditions of a marriage between Mary and the Earl of Leicester, met at Berwick on the 19th of November—Bedford and Randolph on the part of Elizabeth, Moray and Lethington on that of Mary.[2] Their proceedings for several days appear to have been rather convivial and facetious, than as if they had any serious thoughts of fixing anything so chimerical on a business-like foundation. The letters of Randolph, which were of course prepared with a view to Mary's inspection, report the farce of her two ministers affecting to guess successively the Duke of Norfolk, Lord Darnley, and other English nobles, as the person intended by Elizabeth for their Sovereign, when his previous correspondence with Cecil proves that they had been parties to the business for nearly a year before, and had testified their good mind to the same. In unravelling the affairs of this period, the confusion and difficulty produced by the eternal contradiction of Randolph's letters, may be spared by recollecting that he occasionally wrote two sets of reports —one strictly private and confidential, the other to be used for diplomatic purposes. The Duke of Châtelherault, the Earl of Argyll, and others of the Presbyterian portion of the Scottish nobles, were in favour of this marriage, because Leicester was the political leader of the Puritan party in England. According to Melville,[3] "Leicester had written such discreet and wise letters unto my Lord of Moray for his excuses, that the Queen appeared to have so good liking of him as that the Queen of England began to fear and suspect that the said marriage might perchance take effect, and therefore my Lord Darnley obtained the rather license to come in Scotland, who was a lovely

[1] Labanoff, vol. i. p. 244.

[2] Keith; Chalmers; Tytler; Robertson. State Paper Office MSS., Scotland.

[3] Memoirs of Sir James Melville, pp. 129, 130.

youth, in hopes that he should prevail, being present, before Leicester, who was absent. Which license was obtained by means of the Secretary Cecil, not that he was minded that either of the marriages should take effect, but with such shifts and practices to keep the Queen as long unmarried as he could. For he persuaded himself that my Lord Darnley durst not pass forward without the consent of the Queen of England to the said marriage, his land lying in England, and his mother remaining there. So he thought it lay in the Queen his own mistress's hand to let the marriage go forward, or to stay the same at her pleasure; and in case my Lord Darnley would disobey the Queen of England's charge to come back at her call, intended to forfault him, whereby he should lose all his lands, rights, and titles that he had in England.[1] The great obstacle to his coming had been smoothed by his mother, the Countess of Lennox, resigning her claims to the Angus peerage and estates in favour of the present possessor (Morton's nephew), so that matters were daily progressing towards the accomplishment of an event which Mary's most prudent advisers considered more for her happiness, and the good of her realm, than the most splendid of her Continental offers. All French statesmen beheld with alarm the prospect of an alliance of which the probable results would be, the consolidation of the Britannic realms under one head. Cardinal de Lorraine endeavoured once more to persuade Mary to accept one of her royal brothers-in-law of France or the Prince de Condé. But Mary was rather irritated than pleased by these proposals; she even expressed herself as offended by the officious interference of her uncles, "in which," she observed, "they studied their own interests rather than her good."[2]

At the close of the year 1564 a new suitor appeared, whose name has never before been identified in modern history among the numerous catalogue of Mary Stuart's wooers. She was earnestly sought for Francis Bourbon, the Count-Dauphin of Auvergne, by his father, the Prince-

[1] Memoirs of Sir James Melville.
[2] Randolph to Cecil—Keith.

Dauphin; but she, having borne the regal Gallic title of Dauphiness of Vienne, would not listen to the proposal of a vassal prince of the brother of her late royal husband. She gave his envoy, Roullard, very honourable treatment, but made him the bearer of letters to the Dauphin of Auvergne and his son, courteously declining the suit, although it was favoured by the Court of France.

"The said Roullard," writes de Foix[1] to Catherine de Medicis, after relating Queen Mary's rejection of the Dauphin of Auvergne's son, "can tell you the merry life this lady leads, employing her mornings in the chase, and her evenings in balls and masques. Your Majesty will think this strange, but this is now the usual way of spending her time in Scotland, where the Earl of Lennox, as the most favoured, leads her the oftenest to the dance; and she sometimes, for want of another, will permit this honour to one of his gentlemen-in-waiting. It is confidently said that she will be married before six months are past, although I do not believe it can be so soon. She has begun to marry her four Maries, and says 'she means to be of that band.' The son of the Earl of Lennox, who is called *Milord* Darnelie, has at last, after long solicitation, obtained leave from the Queen of England to come into Scotland, and is expected to arrive in two or three days, very honourably attended. By this you may suppose that the Earl of Leicester can have no hope of marriage with this lady, although the Queen of England has offered to promote the alliance by making him a duke, and giving him a revenue of £2000 sterling, which would be equal to 24,000 livres de tournois, and are valued at sixscore according to the old computation."[2]

Mary wrote to her aunt, the Duchess of Arschot, January 3, 1565, to assure her there was no truth in the report that was revived just then, both abroad and at home, that she was going, after all, to wed her old suitor the Archduke Charles. "As to what has been affirmed of the engagement between the son of the Emperor and me," she observes, "they are misinformed who say so. Some negotiations

[1] Ambassade de Paul de Foix, in Teulet's Collection, vol. ii. [2] Ibid.

there were between the Cardinal de Lorraine, my uncle, and him, more than a year ago, but I have heard nothing of it since. I can assure you that this is, to speak frankly, the match which is the farthest from my thought; not but what I esteem it high and honourable, in point of rank, but of very little advantage to my affairs either in this realm or that to which I pretend some right." [1]

Queen Mary left Edinburgh on the 19th of January 1565, and after spending a few days at Balmerinoch, arrived at St Andrews on the 28th. "As for Edinburgh, it likes our ladies nothing," writes Knox, in one of his secret-information letters to the English Secretary of State.[2] He and his followers had indeed, by their offensive remarks on her balls, concerts, and banquets, and, above all, their unjustifiable personal observations on her and her fair attendants, succeeded in disgusting the young high-spirited Sovereign with her metropolis. She came there at last no oftener than was imperatively necessary, and escaped as soon as she could from the espionage and impertinent comments to which she too often found herself exposed. St Andrews was her favourite city of refuge: while there, she took up her abode neither at her own palace nor the more splendid residence of the wealthy Prior-Earl of Moray, but at the house of one of the loyal burgesses, where, attended by her four Maries, and a few other chosen friends, she exchanged the fatiguing ceremonies and parade of royalty for the repose and comfort of domestic life.[3] Golden days for St Andrews those, when a private individual of the commercial class possessed a mansion spacious and well-appointed enough to accommodate the Sovereign of the realm, and her personal suite—a fact that testifies somewhat for the state of trade, the beneficial influence of the Stuart Sovereigns on the internal prosperity of the industrial portion of their subjects, and the advance of civilisation. Mary was not allowed to enjoy her retreat long uninterrupted; for Randolph followed her, about the 1st of February, with a packet from his own mistress on the subject of her marriage with Leicester. "So soon as time

[1] Labanoff, vol. i. [2] State Paper Office MS. [3] Ibid.

served," writes he to Elizabeth, " I did present the same, which being read, and, as it appeared by her countenance, very well liked, she said little to me for that time. The next day she passed wholly in mirth, ' and would not,' as she said openly, ' be otherwise than quiet and merry.' Her Grace lodged in a merchant's house; in her train were very few, and there was small repair from any part. Her will was, that, for the time I did tarry, I should dine and sup with her. Your Majesty was oftentimes drunken unto by her at dinners and suppers. Having in this sort continued with her Grace Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday, I thought it time to take occasion to utter to her that which last I received in command from your Majesty by Mr Secretary's letter, which was to know her resolution touching those matters propounded at Berwick by my Lord of Bedford and me to my Lords of Moray and Lethington. I had no sooner spoken these words but she saith, ' I see now well that you are weary of this company and treatment. I sent for you to be merry, and to see how, like a bourgeoise wife, I live with my little troop; and you will interrupt our pastime with your grave and great matters. I pray you, sir, if you be weary here, return home to Edinburgh, and keep your gravity and great ambassade until the Queen come thither; for I assure you you shall not get her here, nor I know not myself where she is become. You see neither cloth of estate, nor such appearance that you may think that there is a Queen here; nor I would not that you should think that I am she at St Andrews that I was at Edinburgh.' I said," continues Randolph, " that I was very sorry for that, for that at Edinburgh she said ' that she did love the Queen, my mistress, better than any other;' and now I marvelled how her mind was altered. It pleased her at this to be very merry, and called me by more names than were given me in my christendom. At those merry conceits much good sport was made. ' But well, sir,' saith she, ' that which then I spoke in words shall be confirmed to my good sister, your mistress, in writing. Before you go out of this town, you shall have a letter unto her; and for yourself, go where you

will, I care no more for you.' The next day," proceeds his Excellency, "I was willed to be at my ordinary table, and placed the next person (saving worthy Beton) to the Queen's self."[1] As Randolph was at that time apparently much enamoured of the fair Mary Beton, her royal namesake and mistress indulgently humoured the courtship by placing her beside him at the festive board, where stately etiquettes were, for a few brief days of innocent joyaunce, banished. It is to be observed, however, that in this picture of Mary Stuart, in her most unreserved and vivacious mood, there are no traits of levity, no unqueenly follies of coquetry, nor unseemly license of word or deed. Playful she is, and unaffected, but lacking in nothing that is pure, and lovely, and of good report. "Very merrily," continues Randolph, "she passeth her time. After dinner she rideth much abroad. It pleased her the most part of her time to talk with me. She had occasion to speak much of France, 'for the honour she received there to be wife unto a great King.'" That our sarcastic diplomatist makes no sneering comment on Mary dignifying her poor Francis by so lofty a title, may be imputed to the respect inspired by her faithful love to the husband whose memory she continued to cherish, after four years of widowhood, with undiminished tenderness. "She spoke with grateful warmth 'of the affection she had been treated with by the people of France, for which,' she said, 'she was bound to love that nation, and to do them all the good in her power. Those there were among her subjects, too, who had had their nurture in France, were also well affected that way for the commodity of service, as in the Archer Guard; and also her merchants, for the privileges they enjoyed, greater than had been granted to any other nation. How they have long sought for me to yield to their desires in my marriage,' she added, 'cannot be unknown to her Majesty, your mistress. Not to marry, you know cannot be for me. To defer it long, many incommodities may ensue. How privy to my mind your mistress hath been herein you know. How willing I am to follow her advice I have shown many times, and yet can find in

[1] Chalmers, vol. i. p. 123.

her no resolution. My meaning unto her is plain, and so shall my dealings be.'"[1] By enlarging on the advantages offered her by France, Mary desired to impress on Elizabeth's minister that some equivalent must be given by her, if she expected her to prefer the alliance of England to that of her old friends.

The compensation she required would have cost not a penny to England, nor to England's Elizabeth. It was simply the recognition of her right, by the Queen and Parliament, to succeed in the natural order of inheritance to the throne of that realm, in the event of Elizabeth leaving no lawfully-born posterity; and this recognition would have averted the fear of civil wars, and rendered her compliant to any marriage Elizabeth might have considered desirable.

Randolph told Queen Mary "that it was better to let her desire come by time than to seem to force it by importunity." "When heard you me speak of these matters before?" asked she. "Not of yourself," he replied, "but your ministers bear always your mind in their words." "I gave them charge," said Mary, "to consider what were fittest for me, and I find them altogether bent towards you, and yet not so but I believe they will advise me for the best. But so your mistress may guide me that I will leave their advices, and follow hers alone. Remember what I have said—this mind that I am now in cometh not upon the sudden. It is more than a day or two that I have had this thought, and more than this too that you shall know." "I desired her Grace," says Randolph, "not to cut off her talk there, it was so good, so wise, so well framed, and so comfortable to hear that mind in her. 'I am a fool,' saith she, 'thus long to talk with you. You are too subtle for me to deal with.' I protested upon my honesty," continues the diplomatic fox, "that my meaning was only to nourish a perpetual amity between her and your Majesty, which could not be done but by honest means."[2] Leaving Randolph's assumption of honesty unnoticed, as words of course, Mary implied her opinion of the injurious nature of Elizabeth's policy and proceedings towards her in this sensible rejoinder:

[1] Randolph to Queen Elizabeth, Feb. 5, 1564. Keith. [2] Ibid.

"How much better were it that we two, being queens, so near of kin, neighbours, and being in one Isle, should be friends, and live together like sisters, than by strange means divide ourselves to the hurt of us both, and to say, that for all that we may live as friends! We may say what we will, but that will pass both our powers." With a noble burst of feeling the young Scottish Sovereign added, "You repute *us* poor, yet you have found us cumbersome enough. We have had loss—ye have taken scaith. Why may it not be between my sister and me, that we, living in peace and assured friendship, may give our minds that some as notable things may be wrought by us women as by our predecessors have been done before? Let us seek this honour against some other, and not fall to debate amongst ourselves." These sentiments, worthy to have been chronicled in letters of gold, were too much in advance of the morals of the Princes of the sixteenth century to be appreciated by the sarcastic diplomatist through whom poor Mary addressed her appeal to her sister Sovereign. To him it was as foolishness. "I asked her Grace," says he, "whether she would be content one day, whenever it might be, to give her assistance for the recovery of Calais?" At this question she laughed, and said, "Many things must pass between my good sister and me before I can give you answer, but I believe to see the day that all our quarrels shall be one; and I assure you, if it be not, the fault shall not be in me." Randolph then, after commending her good mind towards his royal mistress, warned her not to be over hasty in engaging herself in marriage, and without due regard to the wishes of her good sister, and inquired what he should report to his Sovereign of her mind towards the suit of the Earl of Leicester? "My mind towards him," responded Mary, "is such as it ought to be of a very noble man, as I hear say by many; and such a one as the Queen your mistress doth so well like to be her husband, if he were not her subject, ought not to mislike me to be mine. Marry! what I shall do lieth in the Queen your mistress's will, who shall wholly guide me and rule me." The crafty minister pretended not to understand her words, in order to

have the more hold of them. She repeated the self-same words again, he then professed himself well satisfied, and requested leave to return to his Sovereign, that he might repeat them to her while they were fresh in his memory. "My mind is not that you shall so hastily depart," said Mary. "At Edinburgh we may commune farther; there shall be nothing forgotten or called back that hath been said. I have received a very loving letter from my good sister, and this night or to-morrow morning will write another, which you must send away."[1] Randolph made great profession of his good-will towards her service, and thus ended the conference with which he concludes his official report of Mary Stuart's way of life, her manners, language, and behaviour, during his sojourn of nearly five days with her and her ladies in the merchant's house at St Andrews. The dwelling honoured by Mary's use, on this occasion, is supposed to have occupied the site of one of those commodious and pleasantly situated mansions on the south side of the eastern extremity of South Street.[2]

The merry days of Mary Stuart were few in number; those she spent in her favourite merchant's house at St Andrews, in 1564, were limited to ten. It was her last blithe visit, never again to be repeated. She left St Andrews on the 7th of February for Anstruther Castle.[3] While there she addressed a letter to Queen Elizabeth, complaining of the misusage two of her Aberdeen mariners had received from an English pirate. She advanced to Lundie on the 12th, and arrived at Wemyss Castle on the 13th. Queen Mary's progresses, according to her unfriendly chronicler, Knox, were always attended with evil consequences to the country through which she travelled. Neither fires nor fevers followed in her wake on this occasion, it is true, but the price of provisions (no bad thing for the farmers) was raised very much in consequence, and wildfowl became so dear that partridges were sold at a crown a-piece. The severity of the weather, and the intense frosts of the preceding winter, having

[1] Randolph to Queen Elizabeth, Feb. 5, 1564–5—Keith.

[2] See the Hist. of St Andrews, by the Rev. C. Lyon.

[3] Mary dates her letter to Elizabeth, written there, "From *the Struthers*."—Labanoff, vol. i.

caused a great mortality among birds of all descriptions, their scarcity may be more reasonably attributed to that circumstance than to the devourings of the Queen and her company, whose consumption would not have had any particular effect in a district so abounding in winged game as the coast of Fife. Mary's retinue was very slender at this time. She was not travelling in royal state, having a particular motive for avoiding publicity, for she had received notice that her long-expected kinsman, Lord Darnley, had commenced his journey to Scotland; and, in order to escape the impertinent observation of the enemies of the Lennox party, she had determined that their first interview should take place in the secluded Castle of West Wemyss.

About the same time Mary left St Andrews, Darnley arrived at Berwick. As he was the bearer of credentials from Queen Elizabeth, and letters of recommendation to Randolph from the Earl of Leicester, he was received by the English authorities with the distinction his high rank as the first Prince of the Blood-royal claimed. His first resting-place, after crossing the Border, was Dunbar; the second night he slept at Haddington, and the next morning paused on his road to Edinburgh, to dine with Lord Seton at Seton Castle. This friendly acceptance of hospitality was taken in evil part by his maternal kinsfolk of the house of Douglas, because of a fracas in which one of the clan, named Francis, had been hurt by the Setons.[1]

Darnley had outridden all his followers but one servant, and performed the long wintry journey, in bad weather, and worse roads, with such unexampled speed that, when he arrived, even those who were anticipating his approach could not believe it was him. Many wagers were laid that it was not.[2] "Some," observes Randolph, "because a few days before I went to Berwick, thought he had been another man, whom, indeed, I do heartily wish were in his place."[3] —meaning the Earl of Leicester, whose success Randolph imagined would have been certain if he had been as earnest in the pursuit as Darnley. But Leicester preferred assum-

[1] Randolph to Cecil, Feb. 19, 1564–5—State Paper Office MS., inedited.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid.

ing the character of Robert the Unready, to the risk of forfeiting the favour of the one Queen without winning the hand of the other, and had given every facility to his impetuous young rival to enter the lists in person to supersede his nominal pretensions.

When Darnley arrived in Edinburgh he found his father was still at Dunkeld, and despatched a messenger to inquire whether he should proceed to pay his duty to him in person, or cross the water to seek the Queen. While tarrying for the answer, which caused a delay of three nights, he received signal marks of attention and respect, even from some of those who were most annoyed at his arrival in Scotland. "There came unto him my Lord of Morton, the Earl of Glencairn, and divers other gentlemen that were then in town. He dined one day with my Lord Robert, the Queen's brother, at Holyrood House. His courteous dealing with all men deserveth great praise, and is well spoken of," writes Randolph to Leicester.[1] In a letter of the same date to Cecil, after repeating these particulars, Randolph adds, "They like well of his personage; what to judge of his other qualities the time hath not served to have any great trial. There are here a great number that do wish him well. Others doubt what he will prove, and *deeplier* consider what is fit for the state of the country than us; they call him a fair *jollie* young man. Some suspect more than I do myself that his presence may hinder other purposes intended, as that in special whereabout I go. Others, suspecting his religion, can allow of nothing that they see in him. With all these diversities I have had some discourses. Of all others, I can please them least that are persuaded that, if he match here in marriage, it shall be the utter overthrow and subversion of them and their houses. Who these are, I need not in more words to write."[2] The persons pointed at were the Duke of Châtelherault, with the Hamiltons, of his paternal kindred; and the Earl of Morton, as the acting head of the Douglas clan and party, his maternal relatives. "But for

[1] State Paper Office MS., inedited.
[2] Randolph to Cecil, Feb. 19, 1564–5.

anything I see," continues Randolph, "they fear more than they have cause, and yet do no otherwise than I should myself, were I in some of their places. I have spoken with my Lord of Glencairn and my Lord of Morton: the one for the religion, the other to enjoy his own, and to see his friends void of cumber, wish that some other had come in his place." Randolph's estimate of Queen Mary's conduct and disposition is expressed in these emphatic words: "I doubt, for all that, nothing of *her* wisdom, good government, and discretion, but that in all her doings she will take good advisement,"[1]—an opinion proceeding neither from favour nor partiality, since Randolph's prejudices were notoriously the other way, but simply a matter-of-fact statement, founded on the experience of nearly four years' close observation of the character and actions of the youthful Sovereign, whose interests he was employed to injure, not to promote.

While Darnley tarried in Edinburgh for his father's directions, he received particular attention from Randolph, who waited upon him twice; "and because his own horses were not come," continues his Excellency, "I lent him a couple of mine—the best I had for himself, the other not evil for a servant. Upon Friday he passed over the water, and upon Saturday he met with the Queen, where I hear he was well welcomed and honourably used." According to Cecil's notes, "Darnley went to the Queen in Fife on the 13th of February;[2]" he was, therefore, in time to claim her for his Valentine.

Upwards of four years had passed away since the mysterious introduction which took place between Darnley and his royal cousin by lamplight, amidst the sable pomp of her *dule* chamber at Orleans. The pretty boy of fifteen, who then visited her by stealth in the first month of her widowhood, to deliver his lady-mother's letters of condolence to her on the death of her beloved consort, Francis II., and to offer himself, as soon as he should be old enough, to supply that loss, had now completed his eighteenth year,

[1] Randolph to Cecil, Feb. 19, 1564–5—State Paper Office MS., inedited.
[2] Labanoff, Chalmers, and others, state the 16th, but Cecil's authority ought to be preferred to any other.

and presented himself before her in the pride and glory of early manhood, distinguished by his lofty stature, beautiful hair, features, complexion, and princely bearing. He made a very agreeable impression on the Queen, though her commendations, as recorded in the quaint phraseology of Sir James Melville, who was present at their first meeting, appear somewhat homely. "Her Majesty took well with him; she said 'he was the handsomest and best-proportioned *lang* man she had seen,' for he was of a high stature, *lang* and small, even, and *brent up* (straight), and well instructed from his youth in all honest and comely exercises."[1]

Mary's reception of her handsome English cousin, though favourable, was not more affectionate than their close relationship warranted; nor, indeed, quite so much so, since he was only admitted to kiss her hand at his presentation,[2] instead of receiving the honour of a kiss from the beauteous Majesty of Scotland, which, according to etiquette, he was entitled to expect, if not to claim. He had, however, no reason to complain of any lack of courtesy on the part of Queen Mary, for she invited him to take up his abode with her and her fair ladies at Wemyss Castle. This ancient abode of the first Lord-Admiral of Scotland is seated in lonely grandeur, like a mural crown, on the edge of a perpendicular rock, forty feet above the battling waves of the Firth, guarding the centre of the hollow coast between Elie Point and Burntisland, opposite Edinburgh; to the left, a broken line of red-sandstone caves, beginning at the Castle foot, extends, at intervals, upwards of two miles under or between the swelling green hills which form the boundary of the park seaward, and sweep down to the village of East Wemyss, on the craggy beach; then the ground rises suddenly again, and the two dusk-red square towers of Macduff's ruinous castle appear in their stern grandeur, like twin giants frowning from behind the rugged cliffs. The fishers' hamlet of Buckhaven occupies the foreground, Elie Point stretches far out into the waves beyond, and the rifted

[1] Sir James Melville's Memoirs, Bannatyne edit. [2] Knox, Hist. Ref.

crown of Largo Law, more remote, forms a distinct feature in the landscape. To the right, Mary could look beyond Kirkcaldy Bay to Inchkeith, and her own picturesque metropolis, with its castled rock, the loftier heights of Salisbury Crags and Arthur's Seat towering in mid air above the mist-veiled city, and the wooded Corstorphine hills bounding the view. All these the fair Sovereign of that glorious scene might, and doubtless did, point out with natural pride to her English cousin; and more than these, for full in front, across the bay, rising, as it were, from the deep-blue waters, she could show him North Berwick Law, the Bass Rock, and his own rightful inheritance, Tantallon Castle. That mighty appanage of his maternal ancestors, the Earls of Angus, whom Darnley represented in the elder line, he first beheld during his visit to West Wemyss Castle, in a moment which he must have deemed auspicious to his hope of dispossessing the puny boy calling himself Archibald, ninth Earl of Angus, and his wily guardian, the Earl of Morton. Happy it had been for Darnley if his claims to the great Douglas patrimony could have been forgotten, both by himself and those by whom their existence could never be forgiven.

Nearly three centuries have elapsed since those ill-fated cousins, Mary and Henry Stuart, held their mid-winter tryst in that lone fortalice of the Firth, West Wemyss Castle, which derives a melancholy interest from the circumstance; but the tradition is as fondly preserved by the simple population of the adjacent hamlets as if it had occurred within the memory of man. Every fisherboy can point out the tower in which Queen Mary's chamber is situated; and the auld wives' tales imply that she was not idle, for they speak of the "*bra shewed wark* bonnie Queen Mary *shewed* while she was in the Wester Wemyss Castle with Darnley, and that it is still to be seen there." Contemporary chroniclers verify the tradition "that Darnley first gat presence of the Queen's Highness at Wemyss Castle;" but the story of the piece of "*shewed* work" or embroidery executed by her Majesty on that occasion requires confirmation: not that there is any reason to suppose that Queen

Mary—the most indefatigable of royal needlewomen, who even carried her work into the council-chamber—deviated from her modest custom of thus employing her eyes and fingers, even when Darnley was at her side, in the first dawn of their mutual love, but the time was too short for much progress to be made in her stitchery.

The tasteless innovations of the last century have not spared Wemyss Castle, which presents a very different aspect from what it did when Queen Mary and Darnley sojourned within its walls. The principal entrance was at that time in the old east tower—a low arched portal, which opened into a vaulted cloister of extreme antiquity, leading into a quadrangular court in the centre of the building. It was in this quarter that the state apartments occupied by Queen Mary and her attendants were situated, and they could only be approached by a stone staircase from the central court, into which the back windows looked.[1] Her presence-chamber—now the house-steward's parlour—is a comfortable room, but small, opposite to her sleeping-room, which still retains the alcove where her bed stood; and there are the back stairs and lobby leading to the apartments of her lady-in-waiting and other attendants. The accommodations were certainly on a very circumscribed scale for royalty, indicating that Mary's habits were anything but luxurious, if she could be contented with such.

The weather, during Queen Mary's sojourn at Wemyss Castle with Darnley, proved remarkably inclement, even for the season. Drifting snow-storms precluded the recreation of the chase or fowling, and confined the princely pair within the gloomy circuit of its walls, and rendered them dependent on their mental resources for amusement.

[1] These windows have been walled up, and the recesses turned into closets. From one of these was brought forth for my inspection the most ancient piece of plate I ever saw, being a relic of the first Queen-regnant of Scotland, Margaret of Norway—a silver baptismal basin of rude workmanship, and black with age, having the date 1292 distinctly visible. It was presented by the King of Norway to Sir Michael Wemyss, the Lord-Admiral of Scotland, who was commissioned by the Estates of Scotland to bring home their infant Sovereign, that she might receive the investiture of her royal grandsire's realm, but, happier than Mary Stuart, died during her stormy voyage.

This circumstance was greatly to Darnley's advantage; for, unlike the rude unlettered nobles of the Scottish Court, he was perfect in all attainments meet for princely gallant. He understood ancient and modern languages, wrote verses indifferently well, played on the lute, sang amorous roundelays, and danced galliards to perfection. He could, moreover, amuse his royal cousin and her maids of honour with the secret history and anecdotes of the English Court.

Many a scandal of Queen Elizabeth that has never found its way into history, was, we fear, discussed in the Privy Chamber of West Wemyss Castle, during the octaves of sweet St Valentine that year. Of course, the hard usage of Darnley's own mother was not forgotten, nor the persecution she had suffered for having expressed her satisfaction at her royal niece's escape from the English cruisers on her homeward voyage to Scotland; and Darnley had adventures of his own to relate, touching his evasion of the general sentence of incarceration to the Lennox family by a hasty retreat to France,[1] where, thanks to Mary's recommendation of him to her kinsfolk and friends, he received gentle and good treatment for her sake, and was able to use that opportunity for the purpose of improving his French, and acquiring all those accomplishments which were deemed requisite to a princely gentleman. If equal pains had been bestowed in the moral culture of this unfortunate scion of Tudor and Stuart as on mere practical accomplishments, how different might have been his career! Spoiled child and creature of passionate impulses as he was, the elaborate education he had received had not included the weightier matters of temperance and self-control, nor the regnal science of acquiring judgment of character. He had been taught to consider himself born to inherit a throne, and that his will was to be a law to every one around him: a very dangerous delusion even for the most despotic monarch in the world to entertain.

Nothing occurred during the early stages of Darnley's acquaintance with Mary Stuart to bring the defects of his

[1] See the Life of Margaret Countess of Lennox—Lives of the Queens of Scotland and English Princesses, vol. ii.

character into notice. Their domestication in that secluded Castle of Wemyss resembled a chapter of romance rather than an episode in real life, the only alloy to their happiness being the expediency of not appearing too deeply interested in each other's society, and the necessity of parting.

Darnley proceeded on the 19th of February to Dunkeld to see his father, by whose advice he had paid his first devoir to Queen Mary. She left Wemyss at the same time for Balmuto, meaning to return to Edinburgh by a circuitous route. "It will not be six or seven days," says Randolph, "before the Queen be in this town. Immediately after that ensueth the great marriage of this happy Englishman that shall marry lovely Livingstone. God hath hitherto preserved her Majesty's health above the expectation of all men, and yet we are entered into a new winter, as great a storm lately fallen upon us as the last, which wrought us here a number of unhappy diseases. My Lord Darnley—though I would not have it known to my Lady's Grace, his mother—hath taken a little cold, but not much. All other things remain in the self-same state that at other times I have written."[1]

[1] Scotch Correspondence—in the State Paper Office, inedited.

MARY STUART.

CHAPTER XVI.

SUMMARY.

Queen Mary returns to Edinburgh—Meets Darnley there—Queen dances with him at Moray's house—Bothwell returns without leave—Queen's displeasure—Summonses him to answer for his offences—Festivities and banquets at Holyrood House to honour Darnley — Grand marriage of Mary Livingstone—Queen makes the banquet—Endows the bride and bridegroom with lands—Presents the bride with a costly bed—Courtship of Darnley to the Queen—He proposes marriage to her—She refuses him—Will not accept his ring—Intimacy of Darnley with Riccio—Love between Mary and Darnley—King of France offered to her—Her preference for Darnley—Urged by Queen Elizabeth to marry Leicester—Mary demands to be declared heiress to the Crown of England—Elizabeth's angry message—Mary's distress—Diplomatic gossip about Mary's Maids of Honour—Queen Mary's improved beauty and grace—Writes angrily to Queen-Regent of France—Her love for Darnley betrayed by her physician to Cardinal Lorraine—His uneasiness—Warns Mary against the marriage—Darnley incurs Moray's ill-will—Queen apologises to Moray—Her affection to Darnley—Dislike of her people to his Popery—Prince of Condé renews his addresses to Mary—Her secret intention to marry Darnley—They remove to Stirling—He falls sick of the measles—Queen's anxiety—Royal game of billiards—Poverty of Darnley—Earl of Moray retires from Court—David Riccio's intimacy with Darnley—Private marriage between Queen Mary and Darnley in David Riccio's apartment—Dangerous illness of Darnley—Conjugal tenderness manifested by the Queen.

QUEEN MARY returned to Holyrood House on the 24th of February,[1] and found her young English cousin had arrived in Edinburgh before her; the Earl of Lennox being too keen a calculator on the chances of the game to detain his boy at Dunkeld from following up his fortune with the fair

[1] Randolph to Leicester—State Paper Office MS., inedited.

Sovereign of Scotland. Darnley, according to the sagacious counsel he had received from his lady-mother at parting, now sought to propitiate the leading members of the Scottish Cabinet by a discreet distribution of the costly articles of jewellery with which he had been supplied by her for that purpose. This time the Earl of Moray was not forgotten, a diamond of great value being presented to him by the princely aspirant for the hand of the beauteous Sovereign of Scotland.[1]

Moray, in return for this mark of attention, took Darnley to hear John Knox preach; which was, in sooth, rendering him an essential service, in a worldly point of view, as it was considered a sign of a gracious inclination on the part of the young stranger, and tended to mitigate the prejudice which his Popish reputation had created in the Congregation. Both by education and inclination Darnley was a member of the Church of Rome, to which his mother was a devoted adherent. Lennox, whose creed was guided by political expediency, was always of the Court religion; but as in Scotland that practised in the Chapel-royal was at discount with the popular party, he became a regular attendant at the preachings, and induced his son to make a show of doing the same whenever he was not required by the Queen to assist at the mass.

"Yesterday," writes Randolph to Cecil, "both his Lordship [of Darnley] and I dined with my Lord of Moray. His Lordship's behaviour is very well liked, and hitherto he so governeth himself that there is great praise of him. Yesterday he heard Mr Knox preach, and came in the company of my Lord of Moray. After supper, after that he had seen the Queen and divers other ladies dance, he, being required by my Lord of Moray, danced a galliard with the Queen, who, after this travel of hers, is come home stronger than she went forth.[2]

A long conference took place on the 1st of March between the Earl of Moray, the Laird of Pitarrow, and Randolph, on the subject of the marriage between the Queen and

[1] Randolph to Leicester—State Paper Office MS., inedited.
[2] Randolph to Cecil, February 27, 1564–5—State Paper MS., inedited

Lord Robert Dudley, whom they had not yet learned to call by his new title of Earl of Leicester. They agreed that, if she married any other person, it would be to her great trouble and their ruin.[1] It was evidently for the purpose of protecting herself from the confederacy between her own ministers and the English Council, for this unworthy object, that Mary considered it necessary to recall Lennox and send for Darnley.

Meantime Bothwell, encouraged by the recall of Lennox, and the favour enjoyed by him who had sinned so deeply against both Queen and country, sent young Murray of Tullibardine from France to intercede with the Queen for his return, and if he found her inexorable to his petition, to try to purchase the good offices of some of those in power, that he might at least have an allowance from his estates assigned for his maintenance in foreign parts. "How this is accepted, and in what sort it will be answered, I know not," observes Randolph. "Of herself, she is not evil affected towards him; but there are many causes why he is not so well looked upon as some other are. And more favour cannot be shown unto him that was accused to have conspired so as by force to have taken herself, and killed those that were in chief credit about her, and being committed to prison (finding himself, as it may be thought, guilty), broke the same, than unto him that detected the same"[2]—namely, the Earl of Arran, who was still detained in Edinburgh Castle as a prisoner.

Bothwell, finding he could obtain no favour, and rendered desperate by poverty, thought proper to return without waiting for the grace he had humbly solicited. Mary's sentiments on this subject are thus communicated by Randolph to Cecil: "The Queen now altogether misliketh his home-coming without her licence. She hath already sent a serjeant-of-arms to command him to underlie the law, which if he refuse to do, he shall be pronounced rebel. Because that it is thought he will leave this country again, and perchance for a time seek some refuge in England, I am required to write to your Honour to be a mean unto the

[1] Randolph to Cecil, March 4, 1564–5– State Paper Office MS. [2] Ibid.

Queen's Majesty, Elizabeth, that he may have no retreat within her realm, and that warning thereof may be given to her Majesty's officers. Forasmuch, also, as my Lord of Bothwell is charged by Murray, that came last out of France, to have spoken divers unhonourable words against this Queen, and also to have threatened the Earl of Moray and the Lord of Lethington that he would be the death of both at his return into Scotland, and that Murray calleth to witness to these one Dandie Pringle, beside Newcastle, my Lord of Moray hath written himself, and also desireth me to write, to the said Pringle, that he come hither unto him with all convenient speed, to know what he is able to say touching those matters. This Pringle at that time was servant to the Earl of Bothwell, and hath promised to verify the same."[1]

Bothwell, assured of the devotion of the men of Liddesdale, repossessed himself of his old quarters at Hermitage, and established himself there in defiance of his Sovereign, Queen Mary, and her serjeants-of-arms.[2] "One night when he was at supper, one of his servants, called Gabriel Sempill, came from Edinburgh in most *speedful* manner, and cried at the gates 'Horse, horse!' Bothwell inquired the reason of this summons. 'The Earl of Moray is coming towards your Lordship with a great company of horsemen, and all the surnames of Scott and Carr doth mind to be in your way,' was the reply. Bothwell on this took order for the keeping of the castle, and then rode forth, and all Liddesdale with him, in quest of his supposed assailants, but found it was a false alarm." His horsekeeper, meantime, having been left among those appointed to the defence of Hermitage Castle, took that opportunity of stealing two of the Earl's shirts—who, having evidently a scanty stock of linen, missed the same immediately, and threatened to hang the offender. The horsekeeper begged for mercy, and promised to confess a more serious crime if he might be spared. The Earl called him into his presence, to hear what he had to say why he should not be strung up

[1] March 15, 1564, State Paper Office MS.

[2] Letter from Sir John Forster, in Stevenson's Illustrations—Maitland Miscellany.

forthwith, when he confessed to have been engaged in a confederacy with Sempill, Pringle, and Murray, and his page, to have poisoned him when he was in France, which poison was to have been administered to him by his Scotch barber; but when it was all ready the barber's heart failed, and he would not do the deed. Then they resolved to have set upon him in his chamber, when he was alone there, to slay him; but as they were going up the stairs, something frightened them, and they gave up the design. This confession was corroborated by the page, and they declared that they were suborned by Secretary Lethington and the Lord of Pencreth.[1] Bothwell sent these depositions to the Queen, who paid no attention to them, being greatly displeased at his contumacious resistance of her authority. Within a few days she caused him to be summoned to answer to the course of law for his meditated abduction of her person two years before, and for breaking ward in the Castle of Edinburgh instead of standing his trial for the same.[2] There was certainly no appearance, on Mary's part, of the slightest regard or indulgence for Bothwell at the time he was a single man; while Knox tells us there was at this period nothing but banqueting, balling, and dancing in the Court, and "all for the entertainment of the Queen's cousin from England, the Lord Darnley."[3]

The first Thursday in March, a grand dinner was given by the Earl of Moray, to which both Lennox and Darnley were invited, to meet Randolph and most of the Scottish nobles then in Edinburgh. The ladies of the Queen's household also graced this entertainment with their presence, and the Queen sent word "that she wished herself in the company, and was sorry she was not bidden to the banquet." "It was merrily answered, 'that the house was her own, and she was free to come uninvited.' Others said 'that they were merriest when the table was fullest, but Princes did ever use to dine alone.'" Then Mary sent word "that she summoned them all against Sunday,

[1] Letter from Sir John Forster, in Stevenson's Illustrations—Maitland Miscellany.

[2] Knox, Hist. Ref., vol. ii. p. 473.

[3] Ibid.

to be at her banquet at the marriage of her Englishman;" for so she ever called Mary Livingstone's affianced bridegroom, John Sempill, because he was born on English ground.[1]

All the noble company who had dined with Moray came by her Majesty's desire to finish the evening with her in her own apartments. She conversed a good deal with Randolph, and praised Queen Elizabeth's government, "commending her for her mercy and pity towards offenders, and in special that she had not followed the steps of her predecessors in shedding of blood;"[2] which at that time was truth without flattery. When Randolph began to move Queen Mary on the subject of her marriage, she said "she was *minded*," meaning that she had made up her mind to marry. Randolph "prayed God that her choice might be good." "I must have such a one as He will give me," replied Mary, playfully. "God hath made a fair offer in him for whom I have been so oftentimes in hand with your Grace," replied Randolph. "Of this matter I have said enough," rejoined Mary, "except that I saw greater likelihood; nor may I apply and set my mind but where I intend to be a wife indeed:" adding, "that her good sister might do with her as she would, if she would use her as a sister; if not, she intended to do the best she could for herself."[3]

A very interesting autograph fragment was discovered in the State Paper Office by the research of Prince Labanoff, drawn up by Mary Stuart herself, for the purpose of disproving, by a simple statement of the motives which influenced her to ally herself with Darnley, the imputation of rashness or levity in contracting that marriage. In the first place, she briefly and modestly alludes to two only of her numerous matrimonial suitors—Don Carlos, and the Archduke Charles of Austria; stating that a negotiation had long and perseveringly been carried on for a marriage between the Prince of Spain and her, as the Cardinal Grandeville, the Duchess of Arschot, and several of her own

[1] Randolph to Cecil, March 4, 1565—State Paper Office MS., inedited.
[2] Ibid. [3] Ibid.

subjects can testify; but that this treaty was broken off by an agreement entered into by her French kindred, without her knowledge, with the Archduke Charles—an alliance in which she saw no advantage to her own realm, as he was a stranger, poor and remote, the youngest of the Emperor's brothers, disagreeable to her subjects, and without any apparent means of enabling her to assert her rights to the English succession. She therefore resolved not to risk offending her subjects for the sake of one who could not strengthen her authority over them, being herself under their tutelage, without power or money, or even faithful counsel among them, who were in a manner estranged from her in consequence of her having been brought up out of her own country, the difference of religion, and the manner in which she had been compelled to look over the treasons and crimes perpetrated by them against her father and mother, her late lord and husband and herself—these considerations determined her to marry in the isle, to which she was earnestly solicited both by Catholics and Protestants, who had plainly given her to understand that they would not permit her to do otherwise." After this preamble in the third person, the royal writer, becoming more animated as she enters on a subject of heart-stirring interest, assumes her own identity, and continues her recital in these words: "Then Lady Lennox, as she has continually done since my return, sent to visit me, and by letters and tokens solicited me to accept her son, of the blood-royal both of England and Scotland, and the nearest after me in the succession, of the Stuart name, whereby that surname, so dear to the people of Scotland, might be retained; of the same religion as myself, and who would esteem me in proportion to the obligation I should confer on him. On this insisted the Earl of Atholl, the Lord Lindsay—all the Stuarts and all the Catholics. "The Protestants, on the other hand, brought forward Leicester, who wrote to me, and preferred his suit through Randolph; and Moray pretended to enter into this matter, because he knew that his Queen had written to me in favour of it, for the purpose of abusing me and retarding others, as Leicester himself secretly informed me through

Randolph, showing me at the same time how I might induce her through fear to give her consent, even by stirring up troubles in Ireland, which I had the power of doing, as she was well aware."[1] An unexpected page of treachery is here unfolded, if Leicester, the favourite of Elizabeth, and Randolph, her representative, could thus cabal against their Sovereign with the rival Britannic Queen. The fact rests on Mary's assertion, but this is confirmed by Melville's statement of Leicester's private conversations with him in London, and the complacent mention made by Mary to him of the honest letters she had received from Leicester. But Mary thus proceeds with her narrative: "Moray, on the other hand, sought to be legitimated, and, under pretence of love to me, would not stir from me a step, and would have all the offices, strong places, in short, the whole government of the realm, under his control; and, as my Lieutenant-General, he was so well fortified as to hold me in his tutelage, and at last proposed that I should lend the authority of my crown to him and the Earl of Argyll for the ruin of the Hamiltons, as I had done for that of Huntley. This determined me to marry; and this resolution, if not agreeable to all, was at least to all good men, to the Catholics, and to those of my own surname. I confided my purpose to Atholl and those who had pressed me to marry, to the end that they should learn what was the wish of others, and obtain their assistance in it. Then my mother-in-law, Lady Lennox, and her husband, proposed for her husband to come to be restored to his property and honours, and under that colour to negotiate the matter for their son. Having obtained leave, he came hither, and began to employ all their friends, and to practise with others, and, above all, with the Earl of Moray, who, thinking it would never be brought to bear, and that he could break it whenever he chose, in the commencement acquiesced with Lennox, under pretence of the surname, and in the hope that he would co-operate with him for the ruin of the Hamiltons, whom he dared not

[1] Printed in the original French in Prince Labanoff's Collection—Lettres de Marie Stuart, vol. i. p. 298.

otherwise attack. Lennox in this hope sent for his son, and in the mean time I held a Parliament, in which, with general consent, I restored them their estates. The son came, but privily, because Moray, seeing that I was well inclined to this marriage, made means in England for him to be countermanded by the Queen; but he, advertised by his Catholic friends and others of that country, who were not less,"—and here, in the middle of a sentence, breaks off an autobiographical page of Mary Stuart's history, at a point of no ordinary interest—the first appearance of Darnley on the scene. The paper is without date, but the fact of its having been found in the English State Paper Office leads to the inference that it was written during the lugubrious leisure of her prison hours; perhaps it was among the papers torn from her at Chartley. It is impossible not to be impressed with the simple business-like style of the narrative, though embracing a theme so agonisingly exciting as the recollections of her marriage with Darnley, to which the impelling motives were clearly not passion, but expediency—the desire, above all other considerations, of extricating herself from the evil control of Moray; and the virtuous fear lest she should be rendered his tool for the destruction of the Hamiltons, as she had been of the Gordons.

Queen Mary made royal cheer at Holyrood, on the 5th of March 1565, in honour of the nuptials of her fair attendant Mary Livingstone, whose marriage, instead of being, as John Knox erroneously states, "shame-hasted,"[1] took

[1] These are his words: "It was well known that shame-hasted marriage betwixt John Sempill, called the dancer, and Mary Livingstone, surnamed the lusty," (which means the lovely, not the fat). "What bruit the Maries and the rest of the dancers of the Court had, the ballats of that age did witness, which we for modesty's sake omit."—*History of the Reformation in Scotland*, vol. ii. p. 415. He adds, that in those times godliness and virtue were hated at Court; while "filthinesse" was not only encouraged, but rewarded—"as witness," says he, the "Abbey of Abercorne, the Barony of Auchtermuchtie, and divers others pertaining to the patrimony of the Crown, given in heritage to *skippers, and dancers, and dalliers with dames*." It is pleasant to be able to clear the memory of poor Mary Livingstone from the odious aspersion thus thrown upon it by one who ought to have been more conscientiously careful in his assertions regarding his contemporaries. Mary Livingstone's marriage could not be more public than it was, or more free from any cause of reproach. It took place, in the face of the whole Court, on the 5th of March 1565, and her first child was not born till 1566, as the family

place rather later than its original appointment, with great pomp, being publicly solemnised, at the Shrovetide Feast, in the presence of the Queen and her Court, the foreign ambassadors, and the chief of the Scottish nobility. Mary Livingstone was an especial favourite with the Queen. She formed one of a party at the butts, on the 22d of April 1562, in the privy garden of St Andrews, where the Queen and the Master of Lindsay played against her and the Earl of Moray, who at that time bore the title of Earl of Mar. The bride and bridegroom had both been attached to the service of Queen Mary from a very tender age, and were betrothed to each other; but as all the Maries had pledged themselves not to marry till their royal mistress had chosen a second husband, their union was delayed till her Majesty was graciously pleased to break their romantic bond, by signifying her pleasure that it should take place forthwith. The event was openly spoken of in the royal circle at Holyrood in the autumn of 1564, by the Queen herself, as in contemplation; and the preliminaries were arranged early in the new year, as we find from the following paragraph in a letter from Randolph to the Earl of Bedford, dated January 9th. "I learned yesterday," writes his Excellency to Bedford, "that there is a conspiracy here framed against you. The matter is this: the Lord Sempil's son, being an Englishman born, shall be married between this and Shrovetide to the Lord Livingeston's sister. The Queen, willing him well, both maketh the marriage and indoweth the parties with land. To do them honour, she will have them marry in the Court. The thing intended against your Lordship is this, that Sempil himself shall come to Berwicke within these fourteen days, and desire you to be at the Bridal."[1] Nearly two months later, he observes in his letter to Cecil, "Divers of the noblemen are come to this great marriage, which to-morrow shall be celebrated."[2]

records of the house of Sempill testify. This boy, Sir James Sempill of Beltries, was brought up in the same nursery with James VI.; and being educated with him, shared the instructions, and perhaps a few of the liberal birchings, bestowed by that learned pedagogue, George Buchanan, on the royal infant, whom the traitors had deprived of a mother's tender care, and mocked with the name of their King.

[1] State Paper Office MS., inedited.

[2] Ibid.—4th of March.

As Randolph appears to have considered the diligent transmission of every floating scandal touching the royal household of Holyrood, to his grave colleagues at home, one of his diplomatic duties, he would not certainly have omitted, when mentioning the approaching marriage, to add the injurious gossip, tending to impugn the reputation of the bride-elect, if anything of the kind had been in circulation. The respect in which both Mary Livingstone and John Sempill were held by their royal mistress is testified by the affectionate wording of a grant from her to them, which passed the Great Seal on the 9th of March 1564, on the prospect of their espousals. She there speaks of Mary Livingstone "as her familiar *servatrice*, and John Sempill as her daily and familiar serviter, during all the *youthheid* and minority of her Highness's said serviters;" in consideration of which, and also of services rendered by them to the Queen-Regent, her mother, she infeofs them in her town and lands of Auchtermuchty, part of her royal demesne in Fifeshire—so sorely grudged by Melville, and carped at by Knox—the lands and lordship of Stewarton in Ayr, isle of Little Cumbrae in the sheriffdom of Bute, and many other lands and immunities. She also presented to the bride a rich bed of scarlet velvet, with taffety curtains and silk fringes of the same colour, and embroidered with black velvet.[1]

Up to this period Queen Mary had kept herself free from any engagement that might have been urged by Queen Elizabeth as an obstacle to her promises of adoption, and still the treaty for her marriage with the Earl of Leicester was ostensibly proceeding. Jealous of this, or impatient of the fair Scottish Sovereign's cautious policy, the enamoured Darnley, instead of waiting for her to signify her intentions to him through his father or one of her

[1] Book of the Royal Wardrobe, by the late T. Thomson, Esq., of the Royal Record Office. An antique cabinet, covered with small beads of various colours, wrought with the needle in a rich pattern of leaves and flowers, is preserved by Sir Thomas Livingstone at West Quarter, near Linlithgow, inherited by him from Mary Livingstone's brother, the Earl of Livingstone; which relic, according to the tradition of that ancient historical family, was the work of Queen Mary and her four attendant Maries.

ministers, broke through the fetters of royal etiquette, and proposed marriage to her.

Mary, either not so much in love, or more prudent in her demonstrations, checked his youthful presumption. "She took it in evil part at first," says Sir James Melville, "as she told me the same day herself, and how she refused the ring which he then offered unto her."[1] Sir James Melville had been chosen by Mary for her private monitor, which office had been previously offered by her to John Knox, and rudely refused by him. Melville, who considered it rather hazardous, endeavoured at first to excuse himself, though in a very different fashion, by telling her "that her virtuous actions, her natural judgment, and the great experience she had learned in the company of so many notable princes in the Court of France, had instructed her so well, and made her able to be an exemplar to all her servants and subjects. But she would not have it so,"[2] continues he, "but said, 'she knew that she had committed divers errors, upon no evil meaning, for lack of the admonition of loving friends; because that most part of courtiers commonly flatter Princes, and will not tell them the verity fearing to lose their favour;' and therefore adjured me and commanded me to accept that charge. I said 'it was a ruinous commission, willing her to lay that burden on her brother, my Lord of Moray, and the Secretary Lethington.' But she said 'she would not take it in so good a part of them as of me.' I said 'I feared it would cause me, with time, to *tine* her favour;' but she said 'it appeared I had an evil opinion of her constancy and discretion, but doubted not I would alter after I had essayed the occupation of that friendly and familiar charge.' She made me familiar to all her most urgent affairs, but chiefly in her dealings with any foreign nation. She showed unto me all her letters, and them she received from other Princes, and willed me to write unto such Princes as I had acquaintance with, and to some of their counsellors. Wherein," continues the sly courtier, "I forgot not to set out her virtues, and would

[1] Sir James Melville's Memoirs, p. 134.

[2] Ibid., 130, 131.

show her again their answers, and such occurrences as passed between countries, to her great contentment; for she was of a quick spirit, and curious to know and get intelligence of the estate of other countries, and would be sometimes sad when she was solitary, and glad of the company of them that had travelled in other parts."[1]

As Melville was a staunch Protestant, it must be regarded both as a proof of Mary's liberality of sentiment and good feeling, that she was willing to receive private counsel on her personal conduct from him, and also of her sincerity in the request she had previously made to John Knox. Melville assures us that he performed conscientiously the duties of the delicate office his youthful Sovereign had imposed upon him, by telling her of everything which he thought might be taken amiss by her subjects; and she graciously received all his admonitions in good part, and reformed whatever was considered inexpedient in her conduct. Observing, at this time, that the nobility were much offended at the promotion of her favourite singer and musician, David Riccio, to the office of her private secretary, and the marks of confidence and esteem she bestowed upon him, and that no one of them, when they came to speak to her Majesty, found her in consultation with her deformed little favourite, were accustomed to shoulder and push him out of the way, Melville took the liberty of advising him to keep more in the background, for the Scottish nobles would not brook his appearing to put himself in competition with them, and were always jealous of the interference of strangers in affairs of the government. But the Queen, having promoted David to a place of trust, chose to put him on the like footing with her other ministers, and to treat him as if he had been born in the station to which his talents and fidelity had induced her to elevate him. Mary might have remembered, that the ignoble lineage of the favourite minister of her ancestor, James III., was one of his chief crimes in the opinion of the haughty aristocracy of Scotland, many of whom dated their pedigrees before the Deluge; but her high spirit revolted against the insolent

[1] Melville's Memoirs, pp. 130, 131.

demeanour of her peers, and disposed her to vindicate her independence of feeling, by bestowing her personal patronage on talent, from whatsoever class of society or nation it emanated. Melville, seeing the envy against David increased, took occasion to discuss the matter with her Majesty, and to tender his advice on the subject. Mary replied, "that David meddled no further than concerned her foreign correspondence, and in that she must continue to give him her instructions in private, let who would be offended at it." Melville went so far as to remind her of the inconveniences which had arisen in consequence of Chastelar and the Earl of Arran having been too much intoxicated by her affability, and hinted at the necessity of greater reserve. Mary thanked him for his continual care, and promised to take such good order as the case required.[1]

It unfortunately happened, however, that Lord Darnley, having an excessive love for music, took a great fancy to Signor David, whose matchless voice and great skill on various instruments rendered him very acceptable to the princely amateur, and they became very intimate together. Darnley made him the confidant of his passion for the Queen, and David did all he could to facilitate his desire of marrying her. This association with Darnley counteracted the good effects that might otherwise have proceeded from Sir James Melville's sage advice to the Queen; for Signor David became a mutually-trusted counsellor in the royal love-affair, and was, in consequence, oftener closeted with her Majesty than before; and being protected by a Prince of the blood, her nearest relation, he held up his head in the presence-chamber so loftily, that those who were wont to scowl upon him, and elbow him, began to propitiate him with costly presents, supposing that he was the fountain from which all preferments would flow.

Darnley had previously endeavoured to interest a person whose opinion was much more likely to have weight with the Queen than that of David Riccio—namely, her old servant Michel de Castelnau, the French ambassador. The revelations of that gentleman appear to cast a

[1] Melville's Memoirs, pp. 132–134.

different light on the policy of Mary's ministers, Moray and Lethington, from the general inferences that are to be drawn from their subsequent conduct, and, if true, affords additional proofs of their perfidy to their Queen. "As soon as my Lord Darnley arrived in Scotland, with very small means," says Castelnau, "he sought me out, and entreated me to favour his love-suit, knowing that I had free access to the Queen, who did me the honour to consult me on all her matrimonial proposals; and my audiences with her sometimes lasted from morning till night. It was not at first my intention to be on his side; but the affair went on at such a rate that it was difficult to divert her from it. She became like one possessed, as some have been pleased to say, with enchantments, artificial or real, or by the continual persuasions of the Earl of Moray, Secretary Lethington, and others of that faction."[1]

The first person who perceived that the Queen was not indifferent to Darnley was the Earl of Argyll, who told Randolph "that he misliked his coming, for that the affections of women were uncertain;" and further hinted, "that he feared an impediment to the marriage they had among themselves determined on (namely, with Leicester), would arise from her favour to the new-comer." Randolph, perceiving nothing in Mary's manner to warrant Argyll's jealousy, assured him "that her kindness to Darnley proceeded only from her courteous nature."[2] The same opinion he expressed to Cecil, who was satisfied. Not so Argyll, who, having been induced to resign his portion of the Lennox forfeiture, could not behold without displeasure the favour that nobleman enjoyed with the Sovereign, and his growing power and influence. The jealousies and intrigues then fermenting amidst the festivities of Mary's Court are thus unveiled by Randolph: "My Lord of Lennox is come home, restored and established in his lands, in place and credit with the Queen, an instrument ready to serve her against those whom she most disliketh. To this end he fortifieth himself: he joineth with those in most strict fami-

[1] Memoirs de Castelnau—Jebb's Collections.
[2] Cecil's Abstracts from Randolph's Letters.

liarity that are noted greatest enemies to all virtue, as Atholl and Caithness, Earls; Ruthven and Hume, Lords; and the Lord Robert (Queen Mary's brother), vain and nothing worth, a man full of all evil, the whole guider and ruler of my Lord Darnley. These things being spied and noted unto the world, it is easy to see whereunto they are bent that in their hearts are enemies of the truth, and desire nothing so much as the subversion of those that have been the maintainers of the same, as in especial the Duke, the Earls of Moray and Argyll, who, now perceiving their intents, seek by the best means they can to prevent the same. Their chief trust, next unto God, is the Queen's Majesty (Elizabeth of England,) whom they will repose themselves upon, not leaving, in the mean season, to provide for themselves as best they can."[1] This is the opening of the new treasonable league formed by Moray, his brother-in-law Argyll, and the Duke of Châtelherault, with the English Sovereign against their own. Their pretence was the danger that might ensue from Queen Mary matching herself with a consort of her own religion. "They take counsel," says Randolph, "to make suit to the Queen of England, to take order and provide for their Sovereign's marriage in the way that hath been so long in consultation—namely, to match her with the Earl of Leicester, who, being himself a Protestant, might, they think, easily bring her to be of the same religion, or at least to deal more moderately in these matters than she now doth." This implied accusation of Mary's intolerance is contradicted by the fact that she had no power to protect her own Chapel-royal and Chaplains from outrage and insults. Even if she had been of as persecuting a spirit as her persecutors pretended, she never had the slightest opportunity of indulging it; and happy it was for her that the weakness of her political position preserved her from implication in the besetting sin of those evil times—cruelty and oppression in cases of conscience. All Mary's interferences were in the endeavour of exercising the best prerogative of the crown, mercy. She occasionally released the ministers of her own religion, when

[1] Cecil's Abstracts from Randolph's Letters.

141898

exposed to violence, and threatened with death for saying mass, and had been heard to declare "that all persons ought to be at liberty to worship God according to their own consciences, and that she would do so herself under any circumstances.[1]

"By the way," writes Randolph to Cecil, 20th March 1565, "I will tell your Honour a merry tale, but very true, which commonly tales are not. There is one that attendeth on this Court called Moffet, who commonly, once in three years, entereth into a phrenzy. Within these twenty days his passion taketh him in such an imagination that he is the Queen's husband. A great Protestant he is, and very godly when he is in his wits. He came one day into the Queen's Chapel, and finding the priest at mass, drew out his sword, drove the priest from the altar into the vestry, broke the chalice, and threw and pulled to pieces all the robes, relics, cross, candlesticks; and all that was there were cut and broken. The mass-sayer was the Doctor of Sorbonne, and at the hearing of it was the Queen's physician, and, as he saith himself, 'never in greater fear of his life, and hid himself behind the tapestry until this execution of the mass-god was past.' This doth as much anger the Queen as it doth please many others, to have her sacred place thus disturbed." The spirit in which this outrage is recorded requires no comment.

During the whole of the month of March the negotiations and intrigues for Mary's marriage with Leicester were ostensibly proceeding, while her heart was secretly bestowed on Darnley. She was at the same time assailed from France with proposals in behalf of every bachelor or widower Prince of that realm, between the ages of fifteen and fifty, including the youthful Sovereign himself, and his brother. If Mary had not already made up her mind, she might have been more bewildered in her choice than ever, but not even the temptation of presiding once more over the beloved and regretted Court of France could divert her from her purpose of sharing her throne with the man of her heart. It was, however, impossible for her to declare her intentions in Darnley's

[1] Notations from Randolph's letters by Cecil—Keith's Appendix.

favour till she had ridded herself of the pretensions of Leicester. In order to do this she required Elizabeth to fulfil the promise on which she had been lured into that snare, by declaring her the heiress-apparent of the Crown of England, as an indispensable preliminary to that alliance. Elizabeth, after innumerable evasions, at last empowered Randolph to state, "That if Mary would marry the Earl of Leicester, she was willing to advance him to higher honours, and also to favour her title in every way she could, save that of declaring it."[1] Mary, unable to restrain her indignation at having been treated like a credulous child, expressed her opinion of Elizabeth's conduct in very plain language, using, observes Cecil in his notes on the transaction, "evil speech of her Majesty, and alleging that she hath abused her, and made her waste her time." Elizabeth wrote so fierce a letter in reply to these reproaches that Mary appeared for a moment perfectly dismayed, and burst into tears.[2] One of the most amusing features in the whole affair is the fact, that the all-observant Randolph plumed himself so highly on the fallacious notion that he had talked Mary into a romantic passion for Leicester, that he continued blind to the real state of her affections, and fancied that, if Leicester could only be induced to take the field in person, the bright prize, for which Monarchs and Princes had contended in vain, would surrender herself to him at the first summons. Leicester, however, was subject to no such delusion. Secure of the favour of the most powerful of the two Queens, he retreated as much as he could from the false position into which he had been forced, as a pretender to the hand of the younger and fairer of the royal rivals. His backwardness in this affair is thus jocosely commented upon in a confidential letter from Randolph to his brother-in-law, Sir Henry Sidney: "Now I have gotten this Queen's goodwill to marry where I would have her, I cannot get the man to take her for whom I was suitor. How good an end I am like to make of my business in hand your Lordship by this may easily conjecture. But a man of that nature I never found any that may be called to so great honour,

[1] Notations from Randolph's letters by Cecil—Keith's Appendix. [2] Ibid.

besides somewhat else of no small price, and yet will rather choose daily to be trained and led, I know not whither, than yield unto that which may make him blest for ever."[1] Randolph's appeal to Sir Henry Sidney's recollections of Mary Stuart's charms, and the eloquent testimony he bears to the improvement which time, in bringing the beauty of the girl to womanly perfection, had wrought on her since then, may perhaps silence the doubts that have been started by persons in the present century, whether she were as lovely as her contemporaries have asserted. "If," observes he emphatically, "she were unknown, or never seen unto your Lordship, you might well marvel what divine thing that is by whom this great felicity may be achieved. To that which yourself hath been judge of with your own eye there is now so much added of perfect beauty, that in beholding the self-same person, when that you come again, you shall neither find that face nor feature, shape nor nothing, but all turned into a new nature, far excelling any (our own most worthy only excepted) that ever was made since the first framing of mankind."[2] Such then was Mary Stuart at two-and-twenty, when her heart had found, as she fondly believed, an object worthy of her affection; and "love," to use the exquisite observation of St Pierre, the student of nature, "was giving forth all its beauty in the presence of the beloved."

Randolph, though he could penetrate all mysteries of stratagems, and plots, and state intrigues, was too little versed in the sweet science of natural affections to perceive that the improvement in the external charms and graces of the young Sovereign, which he so eloquently describes, was a visible irradiation from the internal rapture that pervaded her soul. So much, indeed, was our ambassadorial spy at fault in his observations, that he actually moralises on the inconceivable stupidity of Leicester in appearing insensible to his good fortune, in having a Queen, a beauty, and her realm offered to his acceptance—the only obstacle apparent to Master Randolph being now Mary's demand of the

[1] Randolph to Sir Henry Sidney, March 31, 1565—Advocates' Library MS., Edinburgh, inedited. [2] Ibid.

acknowledgment of her title as Elizabeth's successor; and this, he insinuates, Leicester's persuasions, if he will only act the lover to good purpose, may induce either the one Queen to concede or the other to forego. "To make this matter shortly off or on," adds our diplomatist, "the Lord of Lethington repaireth to the Court. Then shall we have our two fine Secretaries matched together—a couple as well matched to dance in a yoke as two that ever wrote with the pen.[1] This sarcastic comment on the honourable qualities of Cecil and Lethington, from *honest* Randolph, must have reminded his correspondent of the shrewd proverb, "Satan reproving sin." In order to awaken the jealousy of Leicester, Darnley is thus alluded to, not as the secret object of Mary's love, but as one who, with time and opportunity, may possibly become a dangerous rival.

"There is lately, or, at the least, not long since, come unto us the young handsome long Lord that looked ever so lofty in the Court where he went. I know not what alteration the sight of so fair a face daily in '*our presence* may work in *our* heart.'"[2] Here Randolph mimics Mary's royal style of expression, adding, that "hitherto he had observed nothing to create suspicion, only that it is part of his own evil nature to doubt the constancy of woman." Darnley, signified by the emphatic pronoun "*he*, is gently looked upon, courteously used, and well entertained at all hands; and in this honour that is done unto him he taketh no less upon him than appertaineth unto him."[3] The family *mot*, "*Avant Darnlé—Darrière jamais*," was of course frequently in the thoughts of the beloved of the beauteous Queen of bonny Scotland at this epoch; for Darnley knew, though Randolph had not penetrated the secret, that the object of the astute Scottish Secretary's mission to England was to ask Elizabeth's consent and blessing on Mary's union with him, and to obtain a release from Leicester.

Randolph expresses a wish that he could have his honoured correspondent Sidney with him again in Scotland, though he will neither see the Court as he found it nor the

[1] Randolph to Sir Henry Sidney, March 31, 1565—Advocates' Library MS., Edinburgh, inedited. [2] Ibid. [3] Ibid.

country as he left it—"No," continues he, facetiously, "nor John Knox so bitter in his preaching, since his marriage to his young wife, as when you last heard him. I doubt myself whether I be the self-same man that now will be content with the name of your countryman, that have the whole guiding, the giving, and bestowing, not only of the Queen and her kingdom, but of the most worthy Beton, to be ordered and ruled at mine own will." An ominous circumstance for the royal Mary, that her confidential attendant, the friend of her childhood, who had conned the same lessons, "sewn on the same samplers," and learned to frame her pot-hooks of the same writing-master, withal, should have yielded herself to the despotic guidance and tutelage of the wily agent of Elizabeth, and the confederate of the traitors who subsequently effected the fall of their hapless Sovereign. The conduct of Mary Fleming had not been much more prudent than that of Mary Beton, if we may judge from the observations which Master Randolph addresses to her some-time lover, Sir Henry Sidney, on the subject of her flirtations both with him and Killigrew, another of the accredited spies of England. "Fleming, that once was so fair, being forsaken of all her unworthy servants, that since her arrival never made account of her, for heavy displeasure lieth sore sick, ready to give up the ghost, but with many a sigh heartily wisheth that Randolph (the writer's vain self) had served her when Killigrew, that little spark of a man, first moved her heart to accept so disloyal a servant, that so many times hath sworn 'that he should die for her,' now hath refused the pleasant places and secret corners of his mistress's privy chamber, to match him upon the cook's daughter, who will be found as very a *shrowe* as ever came out of the kitchen.[1] . . She neither remembereth you, nor scarcely acknowledgeth that you are her man. Your lordship, therefore, need not to pride you of any such mistress in this Court; she hath found another whom she doth love better. Lethington now serveth her alone, and is like for her sake to run beside himself. Both day and night he attendeth, he watcheth, he wooeth — his

[1] Randolph to Sir Henry Sidney, March 31, 1565—Advoc. Lib. MS.

folly never more apparent than in loving her, where he may be assured that, how much soever he make of her, she will always love another better. This much I have written for the worthy praise of your noble mistress, who, now being neither much worth in beauty nor greatly to be praised in virtue, is content, in place of Lords and Earls, to accept to her service a poor pen clerk."[1]

Mary, having left Edinburgh on the 24th of March, was at Linlithgow at the time Randolph was indulging his gossiping propensities by writing to his colleague Sidney all this impertinence about her two maids of honour, who had so far forgotten themselves as to listen to the deceitful flattery of these gay English diplomatists and their attachés. Queen Mary had been so much excited by an exaggerated account of the attack that had been made on her uncle, Cardinal de Lorraine, at his entrance into Paris, by the Constable de Montmorenci, in which one of his servants was slain, that she wrote in a transport of indignation to Catherine de Medicis, under the idea that there had been an authorised attempt to assassinate him, as well as his late brother the Duke de Guise.[2]

"MADAME,—I would not allow Lusgerie to return to M. le Cardinal de Lorraine, my uncle, without recommending myself to your good Grace by the bearer, whom I have despatched with him for that purpose, Lusgerie being unable to undertake so long a journey. Inasmuch as I have understood the wickedness that some persons have attempted against my said uncle, I will take the liberty of entreating you to take more care for the administration of justice, the want of which has caused this second outrage. Pardon me, if I tell you that I am assured that you will never have rest nor quiet till you have shown the power of the King your son, in doing justice to those who have rendered so much service to his crown. Forgive me if I write passionately, for I have already lost one uncle and almost this other. I will now leave this vexatious subject and request

[1] Tytler has printed in his Appendix to vol. vi., History of Scotland, a lively letter from the classic Lethington to Cecil, dated a month earlier, acknowledging himself to be under the dominion of Cupid, and asserting "that love was a cure for all other ills." He became the husband of Mary Fleming, who was the granddaughter of James IV., therefore an illegitimate cousin to Queen Mary, whom in beauty she is said to have resembled. Whatever doubts there may be cause to entertain of her fidelity to her royal mistress and friend, she was a devoted wife to Lethington both in life and death, as her letter, begging that no insults may be offered to his dead body, affords a touching proof.

[2] Labanoff, vol. i. p. 256.

you to grant an audience to my ambassador, who will render you an account of all my news. And here I will present my humble commendations to your good Grace, praying God to give you, Madam, in health, very happy and long life.

"From Edinburgh, this 12th of March.

"Your very humble and very obedient daughter,

"MARIE."

Lusgerie, who was Mary's principal physician, and had been attached to her service from her childhood, disclosed to Cardinal de Lorraine the secret of her love for Darnley, and the probability of its ending in marriage. Some hints of the favour with which Mary regarded her English cousin had previously been given to the Cardinal by young Pinguillon, who had been recommended to her service by him, and employed as a spy for the purpose of reporting to him all her words and actions.[1] The deep-seeing ecclesiastic heard with great uneasiness this confirmation of Pinguillon's information, and instantly despatched two confidential messengers with letters to his royal niece expressive of his utter disapproval of the alliance, and imploring her, "if she valued her future happiness, to give it up." He also charged Roullart, one of the accredited bearers of the same, to tell Queen Mary by word of mouth that Darnley was "*un gentil hutaudeau*," (a now obsolete epithet of contempt, tantamount to a high-born quarrelsome coxcomb), "unmeet in any respect to be her consort."[2] This message having been confided by Roullart, in passing through London, to the French ambassador, Paul de Foix—always an enemy to Mary—was by him communicated to the Queen-mother, Catherine de Medicis, and probably reached the ears of Queen Elizabeth before it was delivered to her for whose private admonition it was intended. To Mary the warning was in vain. She was under the enchanting delusion of a passion founded on mere external graces and accomplishments, which blinded her to those unfortunate characteristics of which her uncle's sarcastic estimate was only too accurate: he had probably had sufficient opportunities for personal observation during Darnley's residence in France.

[1] Ambassades of Paul de Foix to the Court of Queen Elizabeth. Pièces et Documens relatifs à l'Histoire d'Escosses, vol. ii. [2] Ibid.

Scarcely had Darnley been a month at the Court of Holyrood before he provoked the vindictive hatred of the Earl of Moray, who had hitherto treated him with the most friendly attention. While looking over the map of Scotland with the Lord Robert, Prior of Holyrood, Moray's half-brother, with whom he had formed one of those sudden intimacies miscalled a friendship, Darnley asked him to point out Moray's lands. Surprised at the extent of the territorial possessions acquired by one who had nothing by inheritance, he rashly told the Lord Robert "that it was too much."[1] This being repeated, Moray complained to the Queen; she advised Darnley to excuse himself to Moray. But what apology could the lover of the Sovereign offer to the possessor of lands acquired as those of Moray had been, that might avail to satisfy him that no attempt would be made hereafter to strip him of those he had taken from the church of which Darnley, notwithstanding his laxity of practice, was a far more bigoted member than the Queen? How could Moray feel assured that he would be suffered to retain the Gordon forfeitures and the Privy Seal grants derived from Mary's inconsiderate bounty, which, while they had assisted to impoverish the Crown, had, as Darnley's rash exclamation implied, made him too rich for a subject? After this there was no good-will between Mary's lover and her premier. Moray did all he could to traverse Darnley, by endeavouring to prevail on Mary to accept Leicester; he had, indeed, entered into a fresh bond with his own party to compel her to do so. His personal influence with the Queen his sister was now over, for Darnley was all in all, and had brought forward David Riccio in a most unwise and unbecoming manner as the Queen's principal adviser, so that all business of importance was referred to him.[2]

The feelings with which the possibility of Mary's wedlock with a spouse of her own religion were met by the country gentry of her realm, are instanced in one of Randolph's letters,[3] in an anecdote which he calls a "lyttle hystorie."

[1] Randolph to Cecil, March 20, 1564–5—Keith. [2] Buchanan. Melville.
[3] State Paper Office, inedited MS., March 27, 1565. "At Edinburgh, after ten at night," Randolph to the Earl of Bedford. Scotch Correspondence.

"What mischief this mischievous mass worketh here amongst us your lordship seeth, and hereby we may conjecture what will ensue if she match with a Popish prince. At her coming to the Laird of Lundie's house in Fife, who is a grave ancient man [with] white head and white beard, he kneeleth down unto her, and saith like words to these: 'Madam, this is your own house, and the land belongeth to the same; all my goods and gear is yours. These seven boys' (which are as tall men as any man hath in Scotland, and the least of them, youngest, is twenty-five years of age) 'and myself will wear our bodies in your Grace's service without your Majesty's charge, and we will serve you truly. But, Madam, one humble petition I would make unto your Grace in recompense of this—that your Majesty will not have no mass in this house so long as it pleaseth your Grace to tarry in it.' The Queen took well enough these words, but asked him 'Why?' He said, 'I know it to be worse than the mickle *devle*,' with many other spiteful words against it."

The Prince of Condé endeavoured at this period to renew his suit by means of his Scotch friend, whom he directed to apply to Moray, telling him "that Cardinal Lorraine had promised to write to Queen Mary in his favour." Moray answered, in his usual blunt manner, "The Cardinal has deceived my Lord Prince, for he has never written in his behalf, and would much rather prejudice his cause than help him."[1] Such, however, was the Cardinal's repugnance to Mary's union with Darnley, that he would gladly have compounded with her to make the exchange. Very different might have been Mary's destiny if she had rewarded the persevering constancy of her Huguenot cousin Condé. Mary was, however, bent on having no other consort than Darnley. Her attachment to him became stronger every day, although she often protested to the French ambassador, Castelnau, "that she had no passion so strong as her desire for the good of her country," and perhaps persuaded herself that she was sacrificing her personal aggrandisement to her duty to her people. "For form's sake,"

[1] Paul de Foix.

says Castelnau, "the Queen of Scotland asked my advice about this marriage, and, after stating the reasons which moved her to the same, begged me to mention it to the King and Queen-mother of France in such a way as to obtain their sanction, as she would be loth to do anything that was not agreeable to them."[1] She commissioned Lethington, at the same time, to signify her intentions to Queen Elizabeth, and to represent "that she was acting in conformity to her directions in giving up her illustrious foreign suitors and choosing an English consort—such a one as, being their mutual kinsman, would, she trusted, be agreeable to Her Majesty." She also despatched an envoy secretly to Rome, to obtain the Pope's dispensation to contract matrimony with Darnley, their near relationship rendering that license necessary to persons of their religion.[2]

The Queen proceeded to Stirling, March 31, attended by Moray, David Riccio, and her usual retinue, and accompanied by Darnley, to whom she assigned lodgings in the Castle, but he boarded himself and his servants. Up to that period the circumspect conduct of the Queen had prevented even Randolph from penetrating the secret of her love for her English cousin, much less the resolution she had taken of contracting marriage with him. He was, however, attacked with a dangerous and infectious malady the day after the arrival of the Court at Stirling, of which we derive the following particulars from Randolph's letter of the 7th of April: "Lord Darnley for five or six days hath been evil at ease: many took it for a cold, and, intending to drive it away by sweating, the measles came out upon him marvellous thick. He was out of danger when I left Stirling. He lodgeth in the Castle, and is there served with a dish of meat at his own charge, and sometimes hath a dish from the Queen's table. Lord Lennox lodgeth in the town, and keepeth house there."[3] The care and attention the Queen bestowed on the invalid, and her

[1] Memoirs de Michel de Castelnau, in Jebb.
[2] Chalmers. Robertson.
[3] Randolph to Cecil, April 7, 1565—State Paper Office MS.

solicitude for him during the period when his life was considered in jeopardy, unveiled the nature of her feelings towards him, so that it was no longer possible for any one to doubt of his being the object of her love. Yet Randolph does not announce the fact till some days later. The Queen endeavoured to beguile the necessary confinement of Darnley within doors, during his convalescence, by providing all sorts of amusements for him, among which billiards was apparently the game thus mentioned by Randolph as practised during his stay at Stirling Castle: "I had the honour," says he, "to play a part at a play called the *bilies*, my mistress Beton and I against the Queen and my Lord Darnley, the women to have the winnings. Beton and I having the better, my Lord Darnley paid the loss, and gave Beton a ring and a broach, with two watches worth fifty crowns. Hereupon dependeth a tale which requires more time than now I have to write."[1] Perhaps the elucidation involved no scandal as is generally suspected, but an explanation that Darnley, who brought but seven hundred pounds with him to Edinburgh, out of which he had to pay the expenses of his own table fees for Court officials, and all the numerous calls that must have been made on the princely wooer of a Queen, had exhausted his scanty stock of money, and was reduced to pay his debts of honour in jewellery, whereof his considerate lady-mother had supplied him with a liberal store.

The Earl of Moray withdrew from Stirling in disgust, declaring that he could no longer endure the superstitions practised in the Chapel-royal, after he had rendered the Queen as uncomfortable as he could by his ill-will to Darnley, and his jealousy of the daily increasing importance of David Riccio, who was observed to spend much time by Darnley's bedside, to whom he carried all the secret business of the Court and Council Chamber. David was now performing, in the absence of Lethington, the functions of Secretary of State, and, in effect, was the Queen's principal adviser since the mysterious bond of friendship that had

[1] State Paper Office MS.

united him and Darnley. Riccio was suspected of moving the Queen to wed Darnley; but suspicion, which generally outstrips the truth, fell far short of it in this matter; for the research of that illustrious northern antiquary, Prince Labanoff, has brought to light a contemporary record, which indicates the fact that, nearly four months before the public solemnisation of their nuptials in Holyrood, Mary Stuart and Darnley were married privately, at Stirling Castle, in David Riccio's apartment, which he had had fitted up as a Romish chapel for that purpose.[1]

The precise date of the secret bridal of Mary Stuart is not given in this Italian document; but as the author states "that it took place after Darnley's illness" (who was convalescent on the 7th of April), and before the return of either of the messengers she had sent to France and England, it must have been in the second week of April; for Castelnau returned from France, with the consent of the King and the Queen-mother, April 18.[2] Paul de Foix, the French ambassador at the Court of Elizabeth, apprises Catherine de Medicis, April 26, that "Randolph had written to inform the Queen of England, that the Queen of Scotland had married my Lord Darnley, son of the Earl of Lennox, without waiting for the regular ceremonies of the Church,"[3]—meaning the arrival of the Papal dispensation; which news the Queen of England had received with great displeasure, saying, "It was very strange the Queen of Scotland should have espoused her subject, as she had only allowed the father and son to enter Scotland for the reco-

[1] Our authority, which is a historical memoir of the affairs of Scotland, from the time of David Riccio's entrance into Mary's service to the 8th of October 1566, is addressed to Cosmo I., and is preserved in the archives of the ducal house of Medicis, whose extinction it has long survived. It is printed in the original Italian, in the Supplementary Appendix of Prince Labanoff's Recueil des Lettres de Marie Stuart, vol. vii. p. 60. The passage relating to the private marriage is p. 67. "This," says Prince Labanoff, "is the first mention of Mary Stuart's private marriage;" but the statements of the author of this contemporary Italian chronicle of Mary Stuart's Court are confirmed by the French ambassador, Paul de Foix, in his letters to Catherine de Medicis. See Teulet.

[2] Labanoff, vol. i. p. 259.

[3] Ambassade de Paul de Foix—Teulet, vol. ii. p. 35.

very of their estates." She declared, in the first transport of her wrath, "that she would send the Countess of Lennox to the Tower;" but for the present she only confined her to her apartment. "She has resolved," continues de Foix, "to despatch Throckmorton in all haste to Scotland, to persuade the Queen that she is not bound by that marriage, and that it will neither turn to her honour nor profit.". Lethington, meanwhile, unconscious of what had occurred at Stirling, opened his commission on the 18th. The formal communication of Mary's intention of allying herself in marriage with Darnley was received by Elizabeth with affected surprise and a great manifestation of displeasure. She declared it would be attended with very evil consequences, and she would never allow it. In her next interview with de Foix, Elizabeth said, "She marvelled that the Queen of Scots had a heart so low as to contract marriage with her subject." De Foix observed, "that the marriage appeared a reasonable one under the circumstances, and not likely to prove inconvenient to her Majesty of England." Elizabeth replied, "that she was displeased at the manner in which it had been done, and that she had intended to marry the Queen of Scotland to a person whom she loved better than Lord Darnley."[1] This was, of course, Leicester, a person, in every respect but talent, infinitely beneath the young Prince whom she declared Mary had degraded herself by marrying. Lethington made matters worse, by demanding the recognition of his mistress as the heiress of the English throne, in case she were disposed to please Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth in the matter of her marriage. To which Elizabeth sharply rejoined, "that she must be first assured that the Queen of Scotland was free to marry; for she had been informed that she was already wedded to Lord Darnley." Lethington protested so earnestly "that it was not so," that Elizabeth began to think she had been misinformed, and said "she would send Throckmorton to Scotland, with instruc-

[1] Ambassades of Paul de Foix, in Teulet.

tions to put it to the test, by a fresh offer of the Earl of Leicester; or if Mary would prefer the Duke of Norfolk, he should be at her service." [1]—"However," observes de Foix, "I have learned, by the letters that the Countess of Lennox received on Wednesday last, that the said marriage has already taken place, and that the Queen of Scotland performs the same offices for the son of the Earl of Lennox as if he were her husband, having, during his sickness, watched in his chamber a whole night, and showing herself very careful and anxious about his malady, he having been vexed for several days with a fever, from which he is now recovered." [2]

The illness, here alluded to by Lady Lennox and the French ambassador, was a malignant ague, or intermittent typhus, which attacked Darnley towards the latter end of April, before he had properly recovered his strength after the measles. The secret of Queen Mary's love had been betrayed by her solicitude for her English cousin during his first indisposition; but it was not till the second, when she was united to him by the holy ties which sanctioned such demonstrations, that she took upon herself the tender office of his nurse, that she kept her wakeful vigils by his restless pillow, and, as she had been accustomed during the sickness of her late lord, King Francis, administered medicine and nourishment with her own hand to the consort whom, with the sincerity of true affection, she had preferred to all the Kings and Princes who had sought her hand during her four years of widowhood. Those years had been checkered with many cares and some griefs; but she had won the esteem and love of her people; her gentle sway and refining influence had been blessed to Scotland. She had loosed the bonds of the prisoners, and considered the low estate of the poor, in providing officers to distribute her alms to the needy, and advocates to plead the cause of those who had wrong. She had established peace in her

[1] Reports of Paul de Foix—Pièces et Documens relatifs à l'Histoire d'Escosses, Teulet's Coll., vol. ii.
[2] Ibid., p. 38. May 2, 1565.

borders, and commercial relations with all the nations in the world. Years of domestic happiness and wedded love appeared now to be in store for her. A flattering dream of these joys, indeed, mocked her; but brief was the glimpse of sunshine that was to be hers, before the gathering of the storm-clouds chased the bright dance of her golden hours, and finally rolled a pall of terrific darkness over the meridian of her days.

MARY STUART.

CHAPTER XVII.

SUMMARY

Position of Mary and her advisers in regard to her marriage with Darnley—Prince of Condé repeats his offer to Queen Mary—Opposition of her nobles against her union with Darnley—His protracted sickness—His pride and violent temper—Queen Elizabeth objects to the marriage—Offers the Duke of Norfolk to Mary—Mary tries to obtain Moray's consent and assistance—Mary's spirited retorts to Elizabeth—Lethington's treachery to Mary—Convention of nobles at Stirling, to consider the Queen's marriage—Their unanimous consent—Mary Sovereign of the Order of the Thistle—She knights Darnley—Makes him a Scottish Baron and Earl—He swears allegiance to her—Mary's courtesy to Throckmorton—Elizabeth's angry demonstrations—Mary intercedes for her aunt, Lady Lennox—Darnley's irascible behaviour to the nobles—They confederate with Randolph against his life—Mary's doating fondness for her husband—They proceed together to Perth—Darnley and his father summoned to return to England—Darnley's haughty reply to Randolph—Moray accuses Darnley of plotting his murder—Queen requires Moray to prove his words—Angry discussions between Mary and Randolph—Randolph predicts to Cecil that Darnley will have short life in Scotland—Conspiracy to seize the Queen and him on their road from Perth to Callander House—The threefold ambush laid in their way—Spirited demeanour of the Queen—She escapes Moray's snares—Arrives at Callander House with Darnley—Stands godmother for Lord Livingstone's heir—Attends a Protestant service and sermon.

In promoting Queen Mary's marriage with Darnley, her deformed Piedmontese Secretary acted in a manner which completely refutes the calumnies subsequently devised by his murderers for the twofold purpose of justifying their own guilt, and impugning the reputation of their royal mistress. Political malice will assert any absurdity; but who can believe that a courtier occupy

ing the position slanderously assigned to David Riccio in the favour of a young and beautiful female Sovereign, would have wished to see her united to a Prince in the flower of his age, whose personal attractions and graceful accomplishments had already captivated her fancy, and might naturally be expected to gain paramount influence over her heart? The part of a faithful servant, anxious to secure the happiness of his royal benefactress, had been performed by David in recommending her to wed a consort likely to prove both agreeable to herself and acceptable to her English friends, and, by uniting her claims with his, to strengthen her title to the regal succession of that realm. Up to this period the conduct of Darnley had been popular and good; nor could his greatest enemies urge a single point in which he had laid himself open to attack.

The deceitful conduct of her brother Moray, in first flattering her with promises of furthering her desire to marry Darnley, and doing his utmost at the same time to excite her Protestant subjects to revolt against it, is thus briefly certified by Queen Mary's own pen, in a subsequent letter to the French ambassador to the Court of England, Paul de Foix, explanatory of the untruthful statements Moray had made on that subject:[1] "The Earl of Moray having perceived that I wished to marry the son of the Earl of Lennox, came to me and said, 'that, since I thought of it, he would do all he could to induce all my nobles and the rest of my subjects to consent, provided I would allow him to manage the matter his own way, and entirely by himself. But to give my subjects the greater confidence,' he added, 'it would be necessary to banish the Roman Catholic religion from the realm.' After this proposition, he asked permission of me to hold his law-day with the Earl of Bothwell; but being arrived in Edinburgh, I was informed that he had practised with some Lords who were there to compel me to follow his counsel, and that, with the consent of several others whom they had gained, it was agreed that, at the Convention I was about to hold

[1] Marie Stuart to Paul de Foix, Nov. 8, 1565—Labanoff, vol. i. p. 100.

at St Johnstone (Perth), they would take the King and the Earl of Lennox prisoners, because I would not agree to those means of promoting my marriage which he had propounded to myself in private. It seemed to me very strange that a subject on whom I had lavished so many honours and benefits should wish to keep me so entirely in his thrall that I was not to undertake anything but by his means, even in regard to my marriage. Fearing, therefore, that if I allowed the Convention to take place at St Johnstone, he would endeavour to pass things that would be both offensive to my conscience and injurious to my crown, I, by the advice of Lethington, postponed the meeting."[1] Moray's party was so strong at this time, and his conduct so audacious, that he entered Edinburgh, on the occasion alluded to by the Queen, at the head of five thousand horsemen, for the ostensible purpose of keeping his law-day with the Earl of Bothwell. When the Queen was informed of this daring attempt to violate the statutes of her realm, and that Bothwell had sent a deputy to excuse his absence, and declare "his willingness to meet the charge, if prosecuted, according to the regular forms of justice, without such manifest danger to his life," she commanded the Justice-Clerk to break up the Court instead of pronouncing judgment, which otherwise would have gone by default against Bothwell. This quiet but determined exercise of her regal prerogative in the face of an illegal assembly sufficiently numerous to create alarm in the breast of a young female Sovereign, destitute of guards for her personal defence, is a proof of the high spirit and moral courage of Mary Stuart. It was the first trial of strength between her and her base brother, who, if she had not been obeyed by her authorities in this instance, would, of course, have proceeded to greater lengths.

It must be observed that Mary showed no favour to Bothwell on this occasion, nor did she reverse his sentence of outlawry or restore his forfeitures. On the contrary, he was under the necessity of instantly leaving the realm, to which he had returned without leave a few weeks before.

[1] Marie Stuart to Paul de Foix, Nov. 8, 1565—Labanoff, vol. i. p. 100.

A last attempt to win Mary was made by the Prince de Condé,[1] through the intercession of her uncle, Cardinal de Lorraine. The love of this illustrious Protestant hero was certainly of a very enduring character. The brave, the honest, the good Condé, was the very man whom her best friends could have desired for her husband; and had she been wise enough to select such a partner, it is not impossible that his virtues and manly tenderness, adorning his religious profession, might have won her to embrace the tenets, or at least to conform to a mode of worship so much more agreeable to her subjects than the ornate Church of the Middle Ages. But Mary was now irrevocably bound to Darnley, and, reckless of the worth of the true heart she rejected, she was occupying herself with personal preparations for the public solemnisation of her nuptials with her secretly-wedded consort. Long ere there was a reasonable prospect of inducing her adverse nobles to consent to the alliance, and while he was yet confined to his bed with illness, Mary had sent to Antwerp for gold and silver tissues and other costly materials, for the bridal robes that were to supersede the *deuil* weed she had so perseveringly worn for her long-regretted consort, Francis de Valois.[2] Meantime a league, offensive and defensive, had been formed, for the prevention of her marriage with Darnley, by Moray and his late enemy the Duke of Châtelherault, and all the ultra-Protestant Lords, who beheld with alarm the prospect of their Sovereign uniting herself with a Roman Catholic consort. It is not in woman's nature to bear ungentle contradiction in affairs of love and marriage. Mary gave utterance, we are told, to words of bitterness and resentment against the Duke and Moray; while Darnley, chafing with impotent wrath, sent his defiance to his father's foe, the old Duke of Châtelherault, from his sick-bed, threatening "to knock his pate as soon as he should be well enough." "So much pride, such excessive vanities, so proud looks and disdainful words, and so poor a purse,"

[1] Despatches of Paul de Foix, in Teulet's Collection—Pièces et Documens, &c., vol. ii.

[2] Treasury Accounts, Royal Record Office, Edinburgh.

observes Randolph, "I never heard of. My Lord of Lennox is now quite without money: he borrowed five hundred crowns of my Lord of Lethington, and hath scarcely enough now to pay for his horse-meat."[1]

In the course of the angry discussions on the subject of Mary's marriage with Darnley, Morton, having been propitiated by Lady Lennox's resignation of her title to the Angus patrimony, turned sarcastically to the two great opposers of the alliance—the Duke of Châtelherault and the Earl of Moray—and said, "It will be long ere you two agree on a husband for her; an she marry not till you do, I fear me she will not marry these seven years."[2]

Queen Elizabeth made Lethington the bearer of a rich diamond, worth six hundred pounds, as a token of love from her to Mary, saying, at the same time, "If your mistress will be guided by my wishes, she will obtain from me more than she either asks or expects."[3] The fulfilment of Mary's request of being appointed the inheritrix of the English Crown was implied in this speech, but not intended by Elizabeth, who confined her benevolence to granting Mary the privilege of taking her choice between those handsome widowers, Leicester and Norfolk, or accepting the third reversion of the mature hand of Norfolk's father-in-law, the Earl of Arundel; but peremptorily interdicted matrimony with the young princely bachelor on whom her dear sister of Scotland had fixed her affections. Mary, who had not only made up her mind to please herself, but by her secret nuptials deprived herself of all power of altering it, was placed in a very delicate position, not having yet obtained the consent of her nobles; and she was perfectly aware that any public manifestation of Elizabeth's disapproval would afford to the majority a general excuse for withholding it. Under these circumstances, as Mary's great object was to gain time, she despatched Lethington again to the English Court, with instructions to endeavour to remove the objections of the Queen and her Council to

[1] Chalmers; Tytler; Randolph.
[2] Hume of Godscroft, Lives of the Douglases, p 286.
[3] De Foix's Despatches, in M. Teulet's Collection.

the marriage. Instead of doing this, he appears to have rendered himself entirely subservient to Elizabeth's policy, and to have betrayed the confidence of his royal mistress. This was only returning to his old practices, if indeed he had ever ceased to be one of the secret-service men of Elizabeth and Cecil.

Conventions were at this period held in all the churches, for deliberation on the best means of putting down Popery, depriving the Queen of the liberty of practising her own religion in her Chapel-royal, and taking order for preventing the dangers to the true evangile that might be apprehended from her marrying a Papist. Any attempt to put down these assemblies by force would have plunged the kingdom into the horrors of a religious war; so Mary left them to say what they pleased, uncontradicted, and diverted public attention by summoning all her nobles to meet her at Stirling, to consider the subject of her marriage. Aware that Moray was the principal mover of the opposition, she made a last attempt to obtain his suffrages when he arrived, by taking him with her into Darnley's chamber, who was still an invalid, and there a paper was handed to him, wherein it was stated, "That since the Queen had contracted marriage with the Lord Darnley, and the Lords underwritten had ratified and approved the same, pledging themselves to grant him the Crown-matrimonial in full Parliament, he was required by her Majesty to subscribe it also."[1] Moray declined doing so, "because the whole of the nobility were not present," observing "that it behoved those to whom he was posterior to sign first; besides, it was a matter too great to be concluded in haste, and without due deliberation." The Queen replied, "that the greater part of her nobles were present, and had signified their consent, and that she hoped he would be so much of a Stuart as to endeavour to keep the Crown in the family, and with the surname, according," she graciously added, "to our royal father's will and desire, as expressed by him a little before his death."[2]

[1] Randolph to Cecil, May 3, 1565—State Paper Office MS.
[2] Knox, Hist. Ref. Scot.

This endearing acknowledgment from the lips of his indulgent Sovereign of the filial relation in which they both stood to James V., elicited neither fraternal nor grateful feelings in reply. Her duteous appeal to the last wishes of that parent whom Moray was quite old enough to remember, was heard with indifference. Zeal for the continuance of the royal name and line of Stuart was scarcely to be expected from a scion of the race whose aspiring hopes were crossed with a bar sinister. One cause of Moray's secret hatred to Queen Mary was, that she had refused to legitimate and place him next to herself in the regal succession, to the exclusion of the house of Hamilton; and he looked with deadly jealousy on Darnley's lawful claim to occupy that position. Moray had not forgotten that their general ancestor, Henry VII., derived his claims to the throne of England, as the representative of the Lancastrian line, from a son of John of Gaunt, born under no better circumstances than himself, but legitimated by act of Parliament and royal favour. Could that point have been conceded, his ambition might have soared even to the highest mark a royally-born grandson of Margaret Tudor could claim—the sovereignty, not of Scotland alone, but of the Britannic Empire.

And was he expected to strengthen Mary's claims to the English succession, by promoting her marriage with the grandson of Margaret Tudor in the female line, the rival Stuart claimant of the reversion of the throne of Scotland too—the presumptuous boy who had carped at the extent of his possessions withal? He made his refusal doubly vexatious to the Queen by grounding it on motives of conscience, saying, "that he should be loth to consent to her marriage with one of whom there was so little hope that he would be a favourer of Christ's true religion, which was the thing most to be desired—one who hitherto had shown himself rather an enemy than a preserver of the same." Mary, who well understood how entirely political Moray's religious professions were, burst into a torrent of reproaches, accused him of ingratitude, and dismissed him from her presence in anger.

This scene, which occurred on the 4th of May, had the effect of rousing the Queen to use all her energies to carry her point; and notwithstanding the discouraging aspect of affairs, she found means to mollify the objections of the most determined opponents to her marriage. In this her Lord Chancellor, Morton, was the principal mover, his own opposition having been vanquished, and his good offices secured, by Lady Lennox—her husband and son engaging to relinquish their claims to the Angus honours and estates.[1] No sooner had Queen Mary received private assurances that her nobles would conform themselves to her pleasure in regard to her marriage, than she despatched John Beton, one of the gentlemen of her household, to meet Lethington, who was, she knew, on his homeward journey to Scotland, and deliver to him two letters—one private and confidential, addressed to himself, couched in the kindest and most gracious terms, and written with her own hand; the other expressing her indignant sense of the perfidy and insolence with which she had been treated by Elizabeth on the subject of her marriage.[2] Throckmorton, to whom Lethington showed both these letters, says of the last, "that it wanted neither eloquence, despite, anger, love, nor passion." Its loss is the more to be regretted by her biographer, for Mary, trained from her infancy to habits of caution in the use of her pen, rarely forgets the high courtesy and stately language of royalty. The instructions contained in this impassioned letter were, for Lethington to return to the Queen of England, and declare unto her, "that since she had been so long beguiled with fair speeches, and in the end deceived, she had now resolved, with the advice of the Estates of her own realm, to use her own choice in her marriage, and to select such a one as she herself deemed best worthy of the honour to which she intended to raise him."[3] Lethington was then directed to pass over to France, and obtain the approbation of Mary's royal kindred there to her marriage. She enclosed an unlimited bill of credit on the receivers of her French dowry-rents for his expenses.

[1] See Life of Lady Margaret Douglas, Countess of Lennox.
[2] Tytler's Hist. Scot., vol. vi. p. 334. [3] Ibid.

It would have required a man of greater mettle than the finessing Lethington to execute these commissions; and perhaps as Mary—a very young woman, opposed in her love-match—had written under strong excitement of feeling, he would have only acted with a prudent regard to her weal in suppressing her haughty message to her powerful and vindictive sister-Sovereign, and representing the imprudence of provoking her unnecessarily. But what can be said of the motives which animated him to overtake Throckmorton, Elizabeth's envoy, who was then travelling to Scotland, and betray the confidential instructions and private letters of his Sovereign to him, using at the same time the most incendiary language, and regretting that Throckmorton was not empowered by the Queen of England to declare war against her in case she persisted in her marriage with Darnley?[1] Such was the conduct of Mary's trusted Secretary of State; but he who had commenced his political career with treachery to her mother, could scarcely be expected to perform the duty of a faithful servant to her. He had been desired to stop Throckmorton's journey into Scotland; but, as if to indicate his contempt for his Sovereign's mandate, he travelled in his company, and lent him every facility for performing it with speed, though perfectly aware how anxious the Queen was to retard his arrival till after the Convention of her nobles had taken place, and she had conferred appropriate titles and honours on Darnley as her consort.

The 15th of May being the day appointed for these important matters, Queen Mary met her nobles in her Parliament Hall in Stirling Castle, and signified her intention of contracting matrimony with her cousin Henry, Lord Darnley, her father's sister's son by the Earl of Lennox; and explained at the same time the motives which inclined her to this alliance in a manner so clear and satisfactory that, instead of the stormy opposition which had been anticipated, a general consent was given, without a single dissentient voice.[2] Moray himself, though present,

[1] Throckmorton to Cecil and Leicester, May 11, 1565—State Paper Office MS.

[2] Keith; Knox; Tytler.

offered no objection, coolly observing, that "seeing the other Lords had all voted in favour of it, he thought it best to do the same."[1]

Meantime, Mary's trusty Secretary of State, Lethington, having arrived in Edinburgh on the 13th with Throckmorton, learned from Randolph what was expected to take place at Stirling Castle, and received instructions from the Queen to detain that unwelcome ambassador for three or four days in Edinburgh, as no lodgings were prepared for him in Stirling, and it did not suit her convenience to receive him at that time, in excuse of which some little indisposition on her part was to be alleged. Instead of obeying his royal mistress's commands, Lethington, as before, made Throckmorton privy to his charge, and obligingly bade him use his own pleasure about going to Stirling. Throckmorton, after a conference with Randolph, commenced his journey thither the same day, slept at Linlithgow, and, starting early the next morning, arrived at Stirling in time, as he hoped, to interrupt the proceedings in the hall of Convention, by delivering a protest, in the name of the Queen of England, against any marriage between the Queen of Scots and the Lord Darnley. When he entered the town of Stirling, he sent his secretary, Middlemore, forward to announce his approach to Queen Mary, and to demand an immediate audience. But on riding up to the Castle the gates were shut against him, and he was told he could not enter.[2] As he was pertinaciously resolved to carry his point, he alighted from his horse, and remained for some time standing before the gates, importuning for admittance. When this was reported to Queen Mary, she, without departing from that courtesy which was one of her characteristic traits, taught him that she was mistress of her palace, and would not submit to an intrusion contrary to her own pleasure, for she sent the Justice-Clerk and the Master of Erskine to request him, in her name, "to retire to the lodging that was appointed for him in the town, for the present,

[1] Knox, Hist. Ref. Scot.

[2] Sir N. Throckmorton to Queen Elizabeth, May 21, 1565—State Paper Office MS.

and after he had reposed himself a while, she would give him audience." Throckmorton pressed for an immediate audience, but was told, point-blank, "he could not be admitted then, her Majesty being otherwise engaged." After this repulse, he had no other alternative than to proceed, as requested, to his lodgings in the town. The unanimous vote of assent to her marriage having been triumphantly carried, in his despite, and dinner over, Queen Mary found herself at leisure to receive her unwelcome visitor. She sent the Lords Erskine and Ruthven, two of her Privy Councillors, to conduct him, with all due respect and ceremonial solemnity, into her presence. He found her surrounded by her Lords, among whom were the Duke of Châtelherault, Moray, Morton, and Glencairn, and many others, whose obliging assent to their Sovereign's marriage with Darnley had not a little surprised the mortified representative of Elizabeth. Throckmorton delivered the message from his royal mistress, declaring "her dislike of Mary's hasty proceeding with my Lord Darnley, as well for the matter as the manner, wherein," he told her, "she had erred by unadvisedness and rashness; and the said Lord Darnley and his parents had failed in their duties to their Sovereign, by presumptuously and arrogantly enterprising so great a matter without first obtaining her leave."[1] Mary replied "that she had given an early intimation of her intentions to her good sister of England, and was surprised at her objections, seeing she only acted according to her request and advice in foregoing the alliance of the Archduke Charles of Austria, and refraining from marrying into the houses of France or Spain. Queen Elizabeth having told her by Mr Randolph 'that, if she would abstain from these, she might take her choice of any person within the realms of England or Scotland,' and because she considered none could be more agreeable to her good sister and the realm of England, as well as to her own subjects, than Lord Darnley, their mutual kinsman, participating both the English and Scottish blood, she did with the less preciseness proceed to the conclusion of the matter."[2]

[1] Sir N. Throckmorton to Queen Elizabeth, May 21, 1565—State Paper Office MS.

[2] Ibid.

Throckmorton used many words in his endeavour to prove to Mary that she had placed too liberal a construction on the wording of Randolph's commission, and that Darnley was never included in the bond—was not suitable for her, and not intended for her. Mary defended herself, and made out her case in reply; and after much time had been wasted in the argument, Throckmorton came to the conclusion, which he communicates to Elizabeth in these words: "This Queen is so far past in this matter with my Lord Darnley as it is irrevocable, and no place left to dissolve the same, unless by violence."[1]

The exit of the unwelcome representative of the English Sovereign was succeeded by a most brilliant and picturesque scene—a revival chapter of the national order of the Thistle, evidently the first that had been held since the death of James V. The whole fraternity, with the exception of the Duke of Châtelherault, and one or two of the aged peers of Scotland, perhaps, had become extinct during the stormy minority and personal reign of the beauteous female Monarch, who had inherited, together with the sword and sceptre of Scotland, the sovereignty of that chivalric order. This was a novel contingency, for never before had the golden spurs and green and purple collar of the Thistle been worn by a lady. Delicate and womanly in all her actions, Mary Stuart was about to exercise her prerogative, for the first and last time, according to the spirit of the Middle Ages, by "choosing her man;" in other words, by investing a male deputy with the privilege of performing the duties of an office strictly masculine.

The substitute selected by Queen Mary was, of course, her own secretly-wedded lover, Henry Stuart, Lord of Darnley. The consent of the Peers of Scotland having been legally given for the solemnisation of their nuptials, he was now formally introduced into the courtly circle as the future partner of her throne, to receive the first public mark of the favour and esteem of his regal bride. It is to be regretted that neither Randolph nor Throckmorton were

[1] Sir N. Throckmorton to Queen Elizabeth, May 21, 1565—State Paper Office MS.

admitted among the privileged spectators of this romantic episode in the tragic history of the ill-fated cousins, to have recorded a few circumstantial details of the demeanour of both, when Darnley, advancing, in the flush of youthful love and joy, to the footstool of Queen Mary's throne, and kneeling before her, pronounced the oath of a knight, according to the time-honoured forms of the code of chivalry.

The words are very curious, and bear too strongly on Darnley's subsequent violation of his duty to be omitted.

"I shall defend the Christian Faith with all my power.

"I shall be leal and true to my Sovereign Lady, the Queen of Scotland, and her successors.

"I shall honour and do reverence always to orders of nobility, and to the office of arms.

"I shall fortify and maintain justice without fee or favour.

"I shall use and exercise myself in the office of chivalry, and help all them that are in the same order if they have need.

"I shall defend the realm of Scotland from all aliens and strangers.

"I shall never fly from my Princess, master, or fellow, with dishonour in time of need.

"I shall defend all orphans, widows, and maidens of good fame.

"I shall do diligence wherever I hear there are murderers, robbers, or masterful thieves, who oppress the people, and bring them to the laws to the utmost of my power.

"I shall inquire and do diligence to search out all articles contained in the books of chivalry, and keep them with all my power.

"I shall fortify, maintain, and defend the noble Order of Knighthood of which I am ready to receive the horse, arms, and knightly habiliment, according to my power. So help me God, the holy Evangel, by my own hand, and by God himself."

Darnley having pronounced these vows, Queen Mary bestowed the accolade of knighthood upon him, and invested him with the habiliment and insignia of the order. She then bade him rise up and exercise the privilege she had just conferred on him, by knighting fourteen of the manorial nobles of Scotland for his companions, and gave him authority over them as the master of the fraternity. Four of these gentlemen bore the surname of Stuart. The fair Sovereign next proceeded to create her own well-beloved knight, Sir Henry Stuart, Lord of Darnley, a baron and a peer of her Parliament, naming him the Lord of Ardma-

nach; lastly, she belted him Earl of Ross, on which occasion he knelt before her and made the following oath:—

"I shall be true and leal to my Sovereign Lady, Queen of Scotland, maintain and defend Her Highness's body, realm, lieges, and laws, to the utmost of my power. So help me God, the holy Evangel, and mine own hand!"[1]

No foolish toying or unseemly follies, such as Elizabeth of England shamed not to practise before the foreign ambassadors and her own nobles at the elevation of her favourite Dudley to the Earldom of Leicester, are recorded of the youthful cousins, Mary Stuart and Darnley, on this occasion. For Mary neither permitted the nearness of their kindred, nor yet the intimate relation in which they now stood to each other, to betray her into a violation of female delicacy and queenly dignity, by an indecorous display of fondness.

"The Lord Darnley," writes Throckmorton to Elizabeth, "received the honours specified, after my audience, the 15th of May, the creation of Duke of Albany only excepted—the conferring of which honour, this Queen, at my leave-taking, which was the 19th of May, did promise to defer till she might hear how your Majesty would accept the proceedings and answer to my legation. Nevertheless, I do find this Queen so captived by love or cunning, or rather, to say truly, by boasting and folly, that she is not able to keep promise with herself, and therefore not able to keep promise with your Majesty in those matters. The day before my departing from this Queen, she made me dine at her own table only; and Mr Randolph, with the Duke and the rest of her nobility, in another chamber. After I had taken my leave she sent the Lord of Lethington to my lodging, who brought me in present from her a chain of gold weighing fifty ounces. This Queen," continues Throckmorton, "hath travailed very earnestly, since my leave-taking, to compound all differences betwixt her noblemen, and mainly betwixt the Earl of Argyll and Earl of Lennox. She intends to depart from Stirling to St Johnstone as soon as

[1] Cotton MS., Calig., b. 10. De Foix's Despatches, in Teulet. Keith. Tytler.

my Lord Darnley shall be able to travel, which is thought to be within four or five days."

Thus it appears that Darnley was still far from well, though sufficiently convalescent to leave his chamber and perform his devoir as the recipient of the distinguishing marks of honour the Queen had thought proper to confer upon him in the presence of the nobles who had, by their unanimous vote, consented to accept him for her Consort. If Mary had not been irrevocably bound to him, it is probable that the determined opposition raised by Queen Elizabeth to the engagement might have effected its dissolution, as Darnley now began to exhibit traits of pride, selfishness, and irascibility, which proved how very unsuitable a person he was for the difficult position he had been rashly chosen to fill. The tenderness and personal attentions of his royal bride, during his lingering illness, in smoothing his restless pillow and anticipating all the wants and wishes of a querulous invalid, instead of inspiring gratitude, had fostered presumption in an ill-regulated mind, and produced the same noxious effects as over-indulgence to a spoiled child. He resented every opposition to his will, and gave way to angry excitement on trifling occasions, and even forgot himself so far as to draw his dagger on the Justice-Clerk, one of the highest law officers in Scotland, when sent by the Queen to break to him the fact that she had been compelled, by prudential considerations, to defer creating him Duke of Albany at the present juncture, lest it should exasperate Queen Elizabeth beyond all bounds.[1] It is too plain that Mary was afraid of telling Darnley so herself. The unsettled state of her Court and Cabinet at this period, and the uncontrollable temper of him to whom she had, in evil hour, plighted her hand, are thus described by Randolph: "Her Counsellors are now those she liked worst—the nearest of her kin are farthest from her heart. My Lord of Moray liveth where he listeth. My Lord of Lethington hath now both leave and time enough to court his mistress, Mary Fleming. David is he that now worketh all—Chief Secretary

[1] Randolph to Cecil—State Paper Office MS.

to the Queen and only governor to her goodman. The bruits here are wonderful; men talk very strange—the hazard towards him and his house is marvellous great. His pride intolerable—his words not to be borne, but where no man dare speak again. He spareth not also, in token of his manhood, to let some blows fly where he knoweth that they will be taken. Such passions, such furies as I hear say that sometimes he will be in, is strange to believe. What cause this people hath to rejoice of this their worthy Prince I leave it to the world to think." If there were no exaggeration in this picture, Darnley must have been both fool and madman, thus lightly to provoke a debt of vengeance blood alone could pay; but the murderous confederacy against him was already formed by the party who finally succeeded in charging their maturely-considered and long-determined crime on the head of his unfortunate consort. Little did the astute junta imagine that the evidence of their friend and approving confidant, Randolph, would ever be brought into a court of equity, to convict them of having come to the deliberate conclusion that Darnley's days must be shortened, as a matter of political expediency, a year and a half before they found an opportunity of executing their purpose in the least dangerous and most advantageous manner for themselves. The anticipatory sentence that it is necessary for their safety that Darnley must die, is thus communicated by Randolph to the English Secretary:—

"When they have said all, and thought what they can, they find nothing but that God" (the profane hypocrites!) "must send him a short *end*, or themselves a miserable life to live under such a state and government as this is like to be."[1] A mystified yet positive inquiry is then propounded, as to what encouragement or support may be expected from Queen Elizabeth, "if aught should be attempted, seeing the most part are persuaded that, for this *end*, he (Darnley) was sent into this country." It is not quite so clear to the uninitiated reader of this record of the diplomatic wickedness of the sixteenth century, whether "this end" were

[1] Randolph to Cecil, June 3, 1565—State Paper Office MS.

intended to imply Darnley's marriage to the Queen of Scots, or, as the previous "short end" unquestionably does, his murder by the English secret-service men. Randolph speaks more plainly in the context: "To see so many in hazard as now stand in danger of life and goods, it is great pity to think. Only to remedy this mischief *he* [Darnley] must be taken away, or such as he hateth find such support that whatsoever he intendeth to another may light upon himself. A little now spent in the beginning yieldeth double fruit. What were it for the Queen's Majesty [Elizabeth], if she list not to do it by force, with the expense of three or four thousand pounds to do with this country what she would?[1]" After this indubitable testimony from the pen of their confederate, of the design meditated against the life of Darnley by the parties who finally benefited by that mysterious tragedy, what reliance can be placed on the fallacious train of circumstantial evidence arranged by the conspirators themselves, for the twofold purpose of diverting suspicion from themselves and fixing it on their unfortunate Sovereign?

Queen Mary left Stirling, June 2d, accompanied by Darnley, his father, and her Court. She slept at Inverpeffing, on the Earn, and arrived at Perth the following day, having convened her nobles to meet there for the necessary arrangements connected with her marriage.[2] Moray had told her, "that, if she would absolutely put down the Roman Catholic religion in Scotland, he would bring the matter to pass, provided she would leave it wholly to his arrangement."[3] Mary observed, both to him in private and openly to the superintendants of the Church Assembly, when they waited upon her, "that it was not in her power to put down any form of religion, for that pertained to the Parliament; and albeit she was not persuaded in any religion but that in which she had been brought up, she was willing to hear conference and disputation on the Scriptures. Also she would be content to hear public preaching, provided it was out of the mouth of such as were pleasing to herself; and, above all

[1] Randolph to Cecil, June 3, 1565—State Paper MS.
[2] Chalmers, from the Household Book.
[3] Letter from Mary to Paul de Foix—Labanoff, vol. i.

others," she said, "she would gladly hear the superintendant of Angus, John Erskine of Dun, for he was a mild and sweet-natured man, with true honesty and uprightness."[1] This reply, liberal as it was, failed to satisfy some of the factiously disposed, because it was said that the Queen was minded that every one should have liberty of conscience.[2]

Moray and his faction, though they had openly assented to Mary's marriage, by their votes in the Convention at Stirling, so recently as the 15th of May, were now perfidiously practising to raise controversial cabals against it, and had sued to the English Sovereign for money and other assistance for its prevention. Randolph was instructed, in reply, to promise them every encouragement. The letters of this unscrupulous statesman, who had hitherto borne fair testimony of Mary's wisdom and virtue, now assume a decidedly malignant tone against her. At this date, June 3, he says, "She doateth so much upon her husband that some report she is bewitched. The parties and tokens are named that contain the mysteries."[3] Darnley's mother, the poor oppressed Countess of Lennox, whom her kind cousin, Queen Elizabeth, had already branded with the convenient accusation of practising enchantments, was the alleged witch; the token through which the magic was communicated was said to be a bracelet which she had sent by her son to Mary.[4] The suspected sorcerer, Patrick, Lord Ruthven, was the intimate associate of the Earl of Lennox, to whom he stood almost in the relation of a brother-in-law, having married the daughter of the late Earl of Angus, by his first and apparently his only legitimate wife. Mary's natural antipathy to this man had been overcome by Lennox and his son, so far as to admit him to her favour and confidence.

Darnley now dined almost every day with the Queen; she lent him half her household officers to serve him, and his table was supplied from her kitchen, and at her expense.

[1] Knox, Hist. Ref. Scot. [2] Ibid.
[3] Keith. De Foix's Despatches, in Teulet.
[4] Innocens de Marie Stuart, by Belforest—Jebb's Collection.

She also defrayed the charges of his father's housekeeping,[1] who was entirely destitute of money, and whose credit was getting low in consequence of the opposition of the Queen of England to the marriage of Darnley and Queen Mary. In the vain hope of persuading Elizabeth to consent, Queen Mary sent John Hay, the commendator of Balmerinoch, to expostulate with her, and to intercede for the liberation of Darnley's mother. "Ye shall declare," she says in her instructions to this envoy, "how we think it very strange and *fremit* (unfriendly), the sharp entreatment and handling of our dear cousin, the Lady Margaret Douglas, Countess of Lennox, our father's sister; and can judge no other but that this her evil and hard entreating is for our cause." Mary adds her earnest desire that Lady Lennox may presently be released, adding many dutiful professions on the part of the Earl of Lennox, and reminding Elizabeth that he came to Scotland with her own will and consent.

"In her heart," observes Knox, "Queen Elizabeth was not angry at this marriage—first, because, if Queen Mary had married a foreign prince, it had been an access to her greatness, and consequently she had been more redoubted by the other. Next, both Harry and Mary were alike and in equal degree of consanguinity unto her, the father of Mary and the mother of Harry being children to her father's sister."[2] This assertion is confirmed by Castelnau, who states "that Darnley was chosen by Elizabeth as a proper person to be the husband of the Queen of Scots, and sent into Scotland for that purpose."[3]

The opportunities of Castelnau for obtaining correct information on this subject, through the spies of the French ambassador de Foix, were good; and those of Knox, as the secret correspondent of the English Secretary, still better, provided the astute southern statesman had made a fair exchange of intelligence in return for that which he received from his northern friend; but Cecil was too faithful a servant to his Queen and country to deem this necessary.

When Queen Elizabeth received Mary's remonstrance,

[1] Randolph to Cecil. [2] Hist. Ref. Scot., vol. ii. p. 481.
[3] Memoirs de Castelnau—Jebb.

she signified her wrath by sending the Countess of Lennox, who had hitherto been confined to her own apartment, to the Tower, and directed summonses to Lennox and Darnley to return home, under the penalty of forfeiture and outlawry.[1] Both father and son had previously been reminded by Randolph that their leave of absence had expired. They replied "they knew it, and hoped her Majesty would be good lady unto them, as they had done nothing to forfeit her favour."[2] They made no preparations, however, for obeying the summons; and even if they had been willing to do so, they could not have left Scotland at this moment with honour, the Earl of Moray having circulated a report, to excuse his absenting himself from the Convention of the Estates of the realm, summoned by Queen Mary to meet at Perth on the 22d of June, that his life was in danger from the Earl of Ross (Darnley), his father, and others in the Queen's company, they having conspired together, in the back gallery of her Highness's lodgings at Perth, to assassinate him."[3]

The Earl of Argyll, Moray's brother-in-law and political ally, absented himself also from the Convention, and vouched for the truth of the charge brought against Darnley. The manner in which it was to have been executed was, according to the testimony of that notable witness of all calumnious tales, Randolph, as follows: "There is," says he, "a quarrel between the Captain of the Guard, James Stuart, and one Grant, servant to the Earl of Moray, who gave the Captain the bastinado. Stuart was sent for, and advised to take his revenge at St Johnstone (Perth), where he should have the assistance of the Lord Atholl's friends and the Lord of Lennox; and that my Lord of Moray, either taking part against the Captain, or being present to rid them, should himself be slain. Of this being advertised, he came not to Court, nor at any time intendeth, but when he shall be able to make his part good against the greatest, his Sovereign alone excepted."[4]

[1] Keith; Labanoff; Chalmers; Tytler.
[2] Randolph to Cecil, July 2, 1565—State Paper Office MS.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Ibid.

Buchanan, in his account of this alleged plot against the life of Moray, pretends that Darnley was to force a personal quarrel with him, in which he was to be slain by Darnley's party; and the first blow was to be dealt by that doughty wight, David Riccio, Darnley's great partisan and political ally, but certainly no bravo.

Darnley fiercely denied the accusation, and manfully offered to maintain his innocence, by appeal of battle, against all who should impugn it. The Queen, in the first instance, treated the report that Moray had brought such a charge against their youthful kinsman—for they were both related in the same degree to Darnley—as an idle and mischief-making tale, and said openly, before several of her courtiers, "that she was little beholden to some who went about to put evil will between her and her brother."[1] Finding, however, that Moray persisted in circulating this allegation, and Argyll protested its truth, "she desired them to name their informer and produce their witnesses, that it might be subjected to a judicial investigation, as it was a report calculated to bring the Earl of Ross and herself into the hatred of her people, and therefore she could not allow it to pass unquestioned, but must insist on its truth being determined by a fair trial, which she pledged herself should be free, and according to the usual course of law."[2] Moray shrank from submitting his charge against Darnley to the test of a legal inquiry. He kept the name of his informer a profound secret, and produced no witnesses.[3]

Queen Mary, in a letter subsequently written by her to Paul de Foix, thus expresses herself on the subject of her brother Moray's attempts to traverse her marriage with her young English kinsman. "Moray," she says, "disappointed in his first attempt to break the marriage, bethought himself of another way of doing it, by spreading a report among my subjects that the Earl of Lennox and the King his son would have him murdered, because he had not

[1] Randolph to Cecil, July 2, 1565—Keith.
[2] Minutes of the Scotch Privy Council in July 1565.
[3] Letter from Mary Stuart to Paul de Foix, Nov. 8, 1565—Labanoff, vol. i. p. 300.

consented to my marriage without the advice of all the nobles; and, perceiving that they would carefully consider the matter before they permitted me to marry, the said Earl of Moray endeavoured all he could to persuade my subjects that the King had the evil nature of a homicide, in order to render them more reluctant to my marriage. Not wishing his false accusations to be believed among mine own, I assembled all the Lords of my Council in this town, Edinburgh, and explained to them that the Earl of Moray had complained that they had desired to have him murdered; and as I allowed justice to have free course with every one, I prayed them to make the Earl of Moray prove what he had said of the King and the Earl of Lennox, and, in case it should be proved to be as he said, I would not permit such injury to be done to the person of him whom I regarded as a brother.[1] In order to elicit the truth, I, by their advice, sent for the Earl of Moray, who was in his house, to come and explain the grounds of his complaint before me, assuring him, at the same time, that I would not proceed any further in the marriage, if the Earl of Lennox and the King should be found guilty of conspiring his death. I sent him, at the same time, such guarantees for his safety as every one knows he could have no reason to refuse to come. Nevertheless he would not do it. I then sent a second time two of the Lords of the Council to him, assuring him he should have a fair hearing, if he would enter into the facts of which he had complained. To this he replied, 'That he could not prove what he had said, but it might suffice me that he believed it, for it was true.'[2] Now, seeing that he would not prove his accusations, and I could not believe that the Earl of Lennox and the King had wished to commit such wickedness, I sent to him, for the third time, a message, giving him to understand that, if he did not come to maintain and prove his words, I would declare him a rebel, and proceed against him as such. Perceiving me determined by all means to search out the truth, with

[1] Letter from Mary Stuart to Paul de Foix, Nov. 8, 1565—Labanoff, vol. i. p. 300.

[2] Ibid.

intent to punish whoever should be found guilty, whether it were the accuser or the accused, and fearing he should be convicted as a liar, he took himself off into Argyll, where he began to make assemblies and conventions to seduce all the nobles to take up arms against me, strengthening himself with the Duke" of Châtelherault. The disaffection of that powerful magnate to Mary's person and government, be it remembered, had been caused by the sinister practices of Moray himself against the united houses of Hamilton and Gordon. The coalition was, therefore, most unnatural.

Leaving Queen Mary's autograph narrative for the present, return we now to the regular course of chronology—for the proceedings in Council to compel Moray to prove his charge against Darnley and Lennox, detailed by her to de Foix, did not commence till the 16th of July, and many events of interest and importance occurred in the interim, succeeding each other with great rapidity, like the progressive scenes of a melodrama.

The Earl of Argyll, and other nobles who had refused to convene at Perth on the 22d of June, in obedience to Queen Mary's summons, assembled, on their own authority, a great Protestant convention at Edinburgh on the 24th. This meeting, though ostensibly for the protection of the Reformed Church from the dangers that might ensue from the Queen's marriage with a Papist, was purely political, and, of course, regarded by her with great uneasiness.[1] Knowing herself to be surrounded with spies at Perth, she determined to withdraw with Darnley and his father, who was now the President of her Privy Council, to the house of the Earl of Atholl at Dunkeld, for a few days' repose and undisturbed deliberation as to the best course to be pursued under these perplexing circumstances. She had fixed the 25th of June for her journey, which was to be performed on horseback, with a very small retinue, her great object at this period being to escape from public observation, and to avoid coming to an open collision with the English faction, flattering herself that the opposition of

[1] Keith; Tytler; Randolph; de Foix.

Queen Elizabeth to her marriage with Darnley would be entirely vanquished by the diplomatic eloquence of Master Hay, who had just arrived in London. Randolph meantime, having received instructions for that purpose, presented fresh summonses from Queen Elizabeth to Lennox and Darnley, enjoining their immediate return to England under the severest penalties.

Lennox, to whom the letter was first delivered by Randolph, appeared much perplexed, observed that he did not look for it, that it would be attended with great inconvenience, and he must take advice, and went to consult his royal daughter-in-law. When Darnley had read the summons directed to him, he said, "Mr Randolph, this is very sore and extreme; what would you do in my case?" The ambassador replied to this childish question by demanding "what his Lordship's intentions were?"—"I will do as you would if you were in my case," replied Darnley; "and yet I mind not to return." Randolph drily inquired "if he should write that for his answer?" "No," said Darnley; "you shall give me some time to think upon the matter." Randolph told him, "that as he had apparently made up his mind as to what he would do, he might as well declare his answer then." Darnley said that "Randolph should not tarry long for it, but could not have it then."[1]

Randolph had also an angry letter from Queen Elizabeth to deliver to Queen Mary, which he intended to postpone till the following day; but hearing she was then about to leave Perth for several days, he craved an audience before her departure. It was granted by Mary; but her countenance towards him was changed. The unfriendly and dishonourable part he was acting had not escaped her attention, and she could not treat him with her usual gracious frankness. "I was received," he says, "in stranger sort than ever I was before, as a man new and first come in her presence, whom she had never seen. I delivered the Queen's Majesty's letter, which the Lord of Lethington did read to her Grace. She required me to speak what I had to say. I told her 'the most part was contained in that letter, which, if

[1] Randolph to Cecil, July 2, 1565—Keith.

her Grace did perform, at the Queen my mistress's request, I have no more to say.' At these words she smiled, and said, 'I trow my good sister will otherwise than so; and if I would give them [Lennox and Darnley] leave, I doubt what they would do themselves.' I said, 'They must do that or worse, now they run into the Queen my mistress's displeasure, which what it is your Grace self may know.' 'Peradventure,' saith she, 'your mistress is of another mind by this time.' I said, 'I doubted not but as her Majesty saw obedience in them, being her subjects, so she would be good unto them.' 'I see no will in them to return,' saith she. I said, 'I was sorry that I saw in them so great tokens of disobedience; but desired that her Majesty would well advise them, and consider what danger might ensue to herself and her country by retaining any such;'" adding some threatening expressions of Elizabeth's vengeful disposition towards all the parties.[1] "I trust," said Mary, "the Queen your mistress be of another mind by this time. You know I have sent thither my ambassador, by whom I have written to the Queen, my good sister, to take these matters in good part; and if those letters had not been despatched before his arrival, I think they had not been sent; therefore I can give you no other answer to those letters at this time, but that I desire to live in good amity with the Queen, my good sister, and I trust she will be of another mind both towards me and the Lord Lennox and his son than when these letters were written." "Other answer of her Grace I could get none," continues Randolph; "and to that self-same effect were the words both of the father and the son, with many protestations and great excuses 'that my Lady's Grace, (Lady Lennox,) was ignorant of all their doings here, and most humbly desired her Majesty that so she might be thought.' These letters, at the first, I am sure did marvellously abash them all. It appeared in her Grace's self weeping, in the father by his sad countenance, in the son least; for I am informed, and somewhat thereof hath appeared in private talk, that he saith 'the danger is not so great as it is made.' His behaviour is such

[1] Randolph to Cecil, July 2, 1565—Keith.

that he is run in contempt of all men, even of those that were his chief friends." A significant allusion to the deadly purpose of Darnley's foes follows in these oracular words: "What shall become of him I know not; but it is greatly to be feared he can have no long life among this people."[1] One year and seven months served to verify the prediction of the untimely fate preparing for Mary's consort. The sword was even then suspended over his neck by a single hair: but by whom? The victim's doom might perchance have been averted, or at least its necessity could not have been coolly pleaded as a godly motive for the crime, if he had not, with greater insensibility than a deaf adder, shut his ears to the voice of the charmer who was wooing him "to ways of pleasantness and paths of peace."

"The Queen herself," records Randolph, "being of better understanding, seeketh to frame and fashion him to the nature of her subjects." Was this, it may be asked, one of the light follies in which Mary is accused of occupying the hours she devoted to the society of the man she had fondly chosen to assist her in bearing the cares of government? The hopelessness of her attempt to guide and instruct the reckless youth, of whose unfitness to be a mate for her Cardinal de Lorraine had vainly warned her, Randolph goes on to testify, "No persuasion can alter that which custom hath made old in him. He is counted proud, disdainful, and suspicious, which kind of men this soil of any other can worse bear." The same pen which has, in a preceding sentence, borne witness of Mary's wise and virtuous endeavours to mould her consort to the inclinations, not of herself, but her people, next proceeds to write unsupported accusation against her conduct. "Towards her Grace's self, I never saw men's minds so greatly altered—yea, I may almost say to utter contempt, against her behaviour without the fear of God, regard to princely majesty, or care that she ought to have over her subjects or country."[2] Words *versus* facts, it may be replied; and the nature of the facts chronicled by the accuser are contradictory to his railings.

[1] Randolph to Cecil, July 3, 1565—printed in Keith. Original in State Paper Office.

[2] Ibid.

But consistency, the indivisible attendant on truth, is seldom regarded by political libellers; and our worthy diplomatist was framing his official report so as to suit the views of Cecil and Queen Elizabeth, and to serve as a useful news-letter in England for defamation of the northern Queen. Ay, and he meant to have additional pay for his authorship;[1] witness the pecuniary "hints and howls" with which he concludes it: "I must *moove* my case again to your Honour, and purposely send this bearer, my servant, to bring that with him which her Majesty thinketh may relieve my need, and make me able to continue service to her Majesty's Grace. I am forced in all places, saving this town, to keep house. How largely I must spend, lay out, and give, where nothing can be come by but with money or by reward, your Honour can judge; and in the more doubtful and harder terms the two Queens do stand, the more is my care, the greater is the charge."[2]

"She is now," he says of Mary, "in suspicion of all men; her Court kept very secret; she dineth seldom abroad, as she was accustomed, but either in her own chamber or with the Lord Darnley, whose lodging joineth unto hers, and a privy passage between them. The father lodgeth farther off, and keepeth house with his son, whose charges the Queen defrayeth; for money of our own" (a sneer at Lennox's poverty) "we have not, and have extended our credit already so far as it will stretch. She is now offended with the most part that serve her; her Maries clean out of credit, and tarry now at home wheresoever she rideth."[3] The intimacy of Mary Beton with him, and the follies of Mary Fleming with Killigrew, and their imprudent tattling, had probably been reported, and caused the royal Mary to treat her favourite maids of honour with less confiding fondness than had been her wont. But she is now alway's in the wrong with Randolph. Lethington, whose trustworthiness we have exposed, was at that time the lover of Mary Fleming. Queen Mary had been deeply displeased with his disobedient conduct in regard to Throckmorton; he

[1] Randolph to Cecil, July 2, 1565—printed in Keith, p. 290.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid.

was aware she distrusted him, and of course Mary Fleming, on account of their connection. "The Lord Ruthven," continues Randolph, "is entered into the like suspicion. The Earl of Atholl yet keepeth his own with the Queen, the father and son. The Lord Robert" (Mary's illegitimate brother), "now Earl of Orkney, misliked of the Queen, but kept in with the Lord Darnley, whom he serves with his cap in his hand, as doth also the Lord Fleming, who were both present when I spoke to the Lord Darnley, and heard all that was spoken about his return to England." Queen Mary's displeasure against her brother Robert, whom she had lately created Earl of Orkney, doubtless arose from his having excited the vindictive opposition of Moray to her marriage, by repeating to him Darnley's rash observation about his having too large a share of crown lands in his possession. This mischievous practice of the Lord Robert, of tale-bearing between Darnley and Moray, was never discontinued.

The movements of the Queen and her little Court are thus described by Randolph: "To Ruthven her Grace went upon Monday to her supper, one mile from St Johnstone, and there remained that night and the whole day till after supper, when she took her horse, accompanied only by these—the father and son, the Earl of Atholl and Lord Erskine, David Riccio the Italian, and my countryman Fowler, born in Kent; with these women—Lady Erskine and Lady Seton, and Ralay the Frenchwoman; and went that night to Dunkeld, to the house of the Lord Atholl, where she remaineth four days. From thence she will to St Johnstone again, and there tarry one night or two; so to the Callander, a house of the Lord Livingstone's, to baptise his bairn. Farther of her Grace's movements I know not."[1]

Mary was in great want of money at this time; but the crisis being too ticklish for her to venture to apply to her Parliament for aid, she endeavoured to raise a personal loan in order to relieve her pecuniary distress. "She sent for sixteen of the principal merchants of Edinburgh, and

[1] Randolph to Cecil, July 2, 1565—printed in Keith, p. 290.

asked them to lend her some ready money, and to become surety for so much, in wares, as would amount to fifty thousand pounds Scots—about twelve thousand pounds English. This they refused, as a thing past their powers; and now," says Randolph, "she is travailing with the whole town to be surety unto certain that she will have to do with in Flanders for the same sum"[1]—a melancholy proof of the destitution of the Crown of Scotland, where, as Randolph sarcastically demonstrates, nothing was to be achieved with an empty purse. There was personal pique as well as political reasons for the unfriendly tone in which he speaks of Mary at this time. "My whole credit in this Court," he says, "is utterly decayed." No wonder. "This whole time I have been at St Johnstone, never man that kept me company but he was noted, and open defiance given to some not to have to do with me; which made some to wake at midnight that were wont to keep me company at noonday. I spake to her Grace but twice in twenty-four days I was at St Johnstone. My Lord of Lennox and Lord Darnley never spake to me, nor I to them, further than your Honour hath heard at the deliverance of the letter."[2]

The anxieties and difficulties of Mary's position produced a perceptible change in her appearance, which that inimical observer, Randolph, failed not to notice, and, with others of her unfriends, to attribute to some secret regret or dislike of her own doings; and for this the violent, jealous, and intractable temper of Darnley must have given her abundant cause: but it was too late to repent, for the irrevocable step had been taken. Pharisaical pity was expressed by Moray "for the extreme follies of his Sovereign," against whose gentle sway he was employed in organising a most unprovoked rebellion, in which the assistance of the Queen of England had been promised by her ambassador.[3]

The news of the incarceration of Lady Lennox in the Tower of London, an act of Tudor despotism for which the

[1] Randolph to Cecil, July 2, 1565—printed in Keith, p. 290.
[2] Ibid.—Scotch correspondence—State Paper Office.
[3] Ibid.

treatment of the Countess of Salisbury by Henry VIII. had afforded a disgraceful precedent, was received with barbarous exultation by Moray and his party, the professed champions of political as well as religious freedom. "They liked well of it," they said,[1] "and wished her son and her husband to keep her company." Yet this oppressed lady was Moray's paternal aunt, whom natural affection as well as manly compassion ought to have inclined him to comfort, and if possible to assist, as far at least as interceding for her with Elizabeth, through his friends Randolph and Cecil. But though Lady Lennox was his father's sister, she was also the mother of his hated rival, the youthful hope of the legitimate line of Stuart, the beloved and chosen of the Queen, through whom she had expressed her hope of continuing that name, so dear to Scotland, on the throne.

The disobedience of Darnley and his father to Queen Elizabeth's repeated summons for their return to England, had involved both in the pains and penalties of treason—penalties she would not hesitate to inflict if these offenders were within her reach. To place them there, that so they might be slain by her sword, appeared to Moray and the rest of the confederate Lords the most convenient way of ridding themselves of these inconvenient settlers in the Scottish Court. The evidence of their deadly purpose against both is furnished by Randolph, in mysterious but significant words: "The question hath been asked me, 'Whether, if they were delivered us into Berwick, we would receive them?' I answered, that we could not, would not, refuse to receive our own, in what sort soever they came unto us."[2] Encouraged by this assurance, Moray and his confederates determined to make a bold attempt to seize their intended victims in the presence of the Queen; to hurry her away to Lochleven Castle, there to imprison her till she conceded to all their demands; and to carry Darnley and his father to Castle Campbell, the stronghold of Moray's brother-in-law Argyll, and from thence to Berwick, where it was proposed to surrender both to English law,

[1] Randolph to Cecil—Keith, 990. [2] Ibid.

and the tender mercies of their offended Sovereign.[1] If resistance or rescue were attempted, more summary measures were to be taken by the conspirators with Darnley. And who that has traced the conduct of Moray, from the first day he became assured of his royal sister's determination to deprive him of political power and importance, by her marriage with Darnley, can be blind to the fact that the plot for the assassination of that unfortunate Prince, and the incarceration of the Queen in Lochleven, devised in June 1565, was but the abortive foreshadowing of the tragedy, consummated in 1567?

When the question as to the reception of Lennox and Darnley by the English authorities at Berwick was first propounded to Randolph by the associate Lords, their plot was confined to that object—an object, however, attended with more difficulty and no less danger than going greater lengths. "I wot not," observes Sir James Melville, "what was in their mind, but it was an ill-favoured enterprise whereuntil the Queen was in danger of keeping [incarceration] or heartbreaking."[2] Queen Mary denounces the sanguinary purpose of Moray in these impassioned terms: "Let him put his hand on his conscience, and ask himself if he can deny that he would have slain those that were with me? and that, among other murders, he had not conspired the deaths of the King and the Earl of Lennox, when I was coming from St Johnstone towards Edinburgh, to prepare for my nuptials, intending to shut me up in a castle? as I can prove by hundreds of gentlemen then in his band, whom I have pardoned since his flight to England."[3] Queen Mary's statement is corroborated past dispute by the declaration of seven earls, twelve barons, eight bishops, and eight secularised abbots, among whose signatures are those of two noblemen to whom leading parts in the execution of the treason had been assigned, namely, Argyll and Rothes—who affirm "that Moray and his assistants conspired the slaughter of the said Lord Darnley, then ap-

[1] Keith; Fairbairn; Spottiswood; Lindsay of Pitscottie; Tytler; Lingard; Chalmers; Bell.

[2] Sir James Melville's Memoirs, Bannatyne Club edition, p. 135.

[3] Letter from Queen Mary to Paul de Foix, Nov. 8, 1565—Labanoff.

pointed to be married with her Grace; also of his father, and divers others noblemen being in her Grace's company, at that time, and so to have imprisoned her Highness' self at Lochleven, and detained her there all the days of her life; which conspiracy was near put in execution in the month of June 1565, as many who were in Council with him, and drawn ignorantly thereon, can testify."[1]

The manner in which the enterprise was to be attempted was as follows: The Queen, who returned from Dunkeld to Perth on Saturday, June 30th, had, as before noticed, promised to ride to Callander House the next day, to honour her faithful servants, the Earl and Countess of Livingstone, by performing in person the office of godmother to their infant heir; and more than this—for Lord and Lady Livingstone were members of the Reformed Church—their babe was to receive a Protestant baptism, and her Majesty had consented to give her presence to a Protestant service at their house.[2] Moray having devoted his Sabbath to a different purpose than attending his royal sister, in the fellowship of brotherly affection and Christian unity, to the place where she was for the first time to join in the worship of a Reformed Congregation, excused himself, under pretext of sickness, from riding with her as she had required.[3] Instead of bearing her on her way with joy for such an object, he had arranged a threefold ambush, with intent to intercept her on her journey, to tear her betrothed consort and his father from her side, to slay them and all who made resistance before her eyes, and then to hurry her away to his mother's house at Lochleven, which he had recently fortified and furnished with artillery for this purpose, and was lurking there to receive the destined prey himself—having deputed the overt acts of treason to his instruments, the Earls of Rothes and Argyll.[4]

A part of the ancient road from Perth to Queensferry can still be traced along the fields to the west of the hill of

[1] Declaration of the Associate Lords in Dumbarton, printed in Goodall. The original document is in the Imperial Library at St Petersburg.
[2] Knox, Hist. Ref. Scot. [3] Privy Council Registers—Chalmers.
[4] Declaration of these noblemen, with others of the Associate Lords, at Dumbarton.

Benarty, which passes through a deep ravine where the Earl of Rothes and his followers lay in wait for Mary and Darnley, near the Parenwell, beside Dowhill.[1] Argyll was to advance with his party from Castle Campbell towards Kinross, and the Duke of Châtelherault was at Kinniel, ready to fall upon her if she escaped the others, and succeeded in crossing the Ferry. Considering the boldness and subtlety of the plan, and the wild loneliness of the country Mary had to traverse, it appeared scarcely probable she would escape the threefold dangers that beset her path. It was known that she would travel, as she had done to Dunkeld, with a very limited train of her personal attendants, and would thus be destitute of the means of defence, either for herself or the object of her affection. The design of the conspirators was, however, penetrated by one loyal and courageous gentleman, Lindsay of Dowhill, who, residing in the immediate vicinity of the Parenwell, had learned that they expected the Queen to leave Perth at ten o'clock on the Sunday morning, and had calculated their movements according to that time. Late on the Saturday evening Lindsay arrived in Perth with this information, which he communicated to her Majesty in her own chamber, for she had already retired for the night, and was about to go to bed. She instantly assembled such members of her Council as were at hand, Lennox, Atholl, and Ruthven, to consider what was to be done. They advised her not to hazard the journey, but thought she was in no less danger at Perth, in case the Associate Lords should combine their forces to attack her.[2] Undismayed by the perils she might

[1] The late Sir William Adam has erected an arch across it at a place where it passed through a ravine, and where, for a few yards, it remains nearly in its original state. The following is inscribed on the arch: "The road to Perth (anciently called St Johnstoun) passed here within memory. The ravine was much longer and deeper. Cottar houses stood round, called *Parenwell*, from the spring which rises a hundred yards below southward. *July* 1838."

Pitscottie says in his History, "About this time the Earl of Rothes, with certain gentlemen, came to *Parenwell*, beside Dowhill, thinking to have taken Lord Darnley from the Queen as they rode from St Johnstoun to the Queensferry; but she, being advertised, passed by before they met."

[2] Innocens de Marie Stuart. Chalmers; Fairbairn; Randolph's Despatches; Tytler.

encounter, the Queen determined to keep her appointment with Lord and Lady Livingstone, or rather to forestall it by starting several hours earlier than she had originally intended. Atholl and Ruthven bestirred themselves, by her directions, to gather an armed escort among their followers, and the loyal gentlemen in that neighbourhood. They did so to such good purpose, in the course of the night, that two hundred horsemen, armed with spears, surrounded the person of their fair Sovereign when she mounted.

Mary with three of her ladies were in the saddle by five o'clock on the Sunday morning.[1] Love, liberty, and empire were at stake, and, more than these, the life of the secretly-wedded object of her affections. Well, therefore, might the young Queen strain every nerve to win the race that was set before her. With Darnley by her side she feared nothing, and was ready to undertake any adventure, however wild and romantic. Long before Moray imagined she had donned her riding-hat, basquina, and foot-mantle, in Perth, she and her company had dashed through the slumberous town of Kinross, swept past Lochleven, and reached the banks of the Forth, attended by a loyal but motley muster of all sorts and conditions of men—for she raised the whole strength of the country through which she passed by signifying her peril. She crossed safely at the North Ferry, and, having by her speed and energy distanced all foes, astonished her loyal friends at Callander House, by presenting herself before the gates at ten o'clock in the bright summer morning, full five hours before she was expected. She had used no more haste, however, than the urgency of the case required; for two hours only after she had passed Lochleven, Argyll came down from Castle Campbell with his force, "thinking," as he deceitfully observed, "to meet her Majesty on that spot, and that she would take her dinner with my Lord of Moray at Lochleven Castle."

Fortunately for her, Mary dined in better company that day, and duly performed her promise of presenting the

[1] Innocens de Marie Stuart. Chalmers; Fairbairn; Randolph's Despatches; Tytler.

infant heir of Livingstone at the baptismal font—a plain proof this that the office of a godmother was not then dispensed with among the early Scotch Reformers. She also gave her presence to the Protestant sermon, which, Knox says, "was reckoned a great matter."[1]

The same day, July 1, Moray, Argyll, and Boyd sent an especial messenger to Randolph, with a joint letter of credence, to communicate their mind to him upon some matters of consequence.[2] This communication was, of course, intelligence of the failure of their projected onslaught on their Sovereign, Darnley, and Lennox, and to furnish him with the most plausible account they could, to make it out that Mary had taken a false alarm. So confident had the English faction been of success, that Cecil entered into his private diary for July 7, "that there was a rumour that the Scottish Queen should have been taken."[3]

[1] Hist. Ref. Scot.

[2] Stevenson's Illustrations, Maitland Miscellany, p. 118.

[3] Randolph to Cecil, July 4. Robertson endeavours to discredit the fact of this confederacy for the assassination of Darnley, but that it was matter of notoriety we need only quote the following remarkable passage from Bannatyne's Memorials, penned some years after the tragedy at Kirk-of-Field, and Mary's deposition: "Robert Hamilton, the Protestant minister of St Andrews, openly declared 'that Mr Knox was as great a murderer as any Hamilton in Scotland, if all things were well tried, and therefore he should not cry out so fast against murderers; for,' said Mr Robert, 'he had subscribed to the death or slaughter of the Queen's husband with my Lord of Moray, which should have been done in St Johnston.' This being repeated by Mr James Hamilton to Knox's servant, Richard Bannatyne, elicited from Knox, who was sick at the time, a curious letter to the reverend accuser, not denying the fact, but sarcastically 'desiring to be resolved whether that ye have affirmed to one or moe that ye have seen my subscription and consent to the murder of Lord Darnley. Of your own conscience and knowledge ye yourself can best testify. I crave your answer, affirmative or negative.'"—Bannatyne's Memorials.

MARY STUART

CHAPTER XVIII.

SUMMARY

Mary receives news of the mutiny at St Leonard's Crags—Goes in person to suppress the revolt—She enters Edinburgh—Fines the ringleaders of the late tumult—Her want of money—Mysterious chest from Flanders—Tailor Nicholson of St Paul's a candidate for Darnley's service—Rumours of Mary's private marriage circulated—Her evening ride to Seton with Darnley—Incognito strolls with him in Edinburgh—Angry scene between Mary and Randolph—Darnley's hostility to Randolph——Mary defends her right to marry Darnley—Refuses to send him home—Will not make merchandise of her religion—She assures her Protestant subjects that she will not interfere with theirs—Her popularity with the people of Scotland—Seditious practices of Moray—Queen Mary strengthens her party by recalling Bothwell—Fresh remonstrances from Randolph against her marriage—Angry altercations—Mary and Darnley's banns proclaimed—Mary creates Darnley Duke of Albany—He is not contented—Requires to be made King of Scotland—Mary declares him King and joint Sovereign by her own authority—Her marriage with Darnley publicly solemnised in Holyrood Abbey—Changes her widow's weeds for bridal robes—Tumult in Edinburgh—Mary calms the people—Repeats her assurances of maintaining their religion—Her conjugal devotion to Darnley—His proud and obstinate disposition—The bridal epithalamium—Stormy honeymoon—Moray and rebel Lords put to the horn—Mary restores Lord Gordon to the honours and titles of Huntley—Angry protest of Queen Elizabeth against Mary's marriage—Mary's spirited replies—Darnley goes in state to hear Knox preach—Attack on him and Queen Mary in the sermon—Compared to Ahab and Jezebel—Darnley suspends Knox from preaching—Hostile scene between Mary and Randolph—Her warlike preparations—Deposes the Provost of Edinburgh.

WHILE at Callander House, Mary received the alarming intelligence that a great number of the Congregational citizens of Edinburgh had turned out in hostile array, and

encamped on St Leonard's Crags, with mutinous purpose. This insurrectionary movement was an evident confirmation of the treasonable purpose of Moray and the associate Lords, who had premeditated the capture of their Sovereign. Mary's spirits rose with the difficulties of her position, and the excitement of having escaped the ambush of her treacherous brother and his confederates. Undismayed at the threatening aspect of her metropolis, and confiding in the loyalty of her subjects in general, she rode at the head of a gallant little escort towards Edinburgh. The suborners of the tumult fled precipitately at her approach, and the insurgents, on proclamation of pardon to all who would peacefully return to their duties, dispersed. The Queen put only four wealthy and troublesome burgesses under arrest, for having assisted the rebels with money they had churlishly refused to her. She merely inflicted a fine upon them, and pardoned the rest.[1]

The pecuniary straits in which the Queen, Darnley, and Lennox were all involved at this time, are frequently noticed by Randolph. In his letter of the 4th of July he writes, "There arrived a ship out of Flanders upon Monday last; in the same there was a servant of the Earl of Lennox, who brought with him a chest, in the which, by the weight, it was suspected there was some good store of money. If that way they have either means or credit, it is so much the worse."[2] The mysteries of the heavy coffer were duly penetrated by our pains-taking ambassador, who, after the lapse of a fortnight, informs his sage correspondent Cecil, "that it was only apparel belonging to one Nicholson a tailor, from St Paul's Churchyard, who was seeking to enter my Lord Darnley's service."[3] He was perhaps freighted with the princely bridegroom's wedding-dress and other braveries from France. The informants of Randolph reported, to the disparagement of the said candidate for Lord Darnley's service, tailor Nicholson of St Paul's, that he had been guilty, four

[1] Randolph to Cecil, July 4. Knox; Spottiswood; Tytler; Chalmers; Keith.

[2] Keith.

[3] Ibid.

years ago, of slaying a man, which, if true, was a very desperate deed for a person of his peaceful profession. The arrival of tailor Nicholson and his chest of apparel from foreign parts was immediately followed by the report of a private marriage between Queen Mary and Darnley, which took place, as was alleged, on the 9th of July—the preceding rumour of the plight which had been actually exchanged between the royal pair, in David Riccio's apartment at Stirling, having been carefully suppressed, lest it should have furnished matter of impeachment against the unpopular little Italian Secretary, as it had been contracted before the consent of the nobles had been asked, much less obtained. The suspicion of her secret nuptials at Holyrood arose from Randolph being denied audience when he requested permission to speak with the Queen. "That whole day," he says, "was solemnised, as I do believe, to some divine god, for such quietness was in Court that few could be seen, and as few suffered to enter. That night her horses were secretly prepared, and at eight o'clock in the evening she rode to Seton, accompanied only by the Lady Erskine, the father, the son, one brother of the Lord Erskine's, Sir David Riccio, and Fowler. How Seton standeth from Edinburgh your Honour knoweth, and with what honour and surety she may so ride I refer me to other; but here it is utterly misliked. Hereupon rose many *fowle* tales, where liberty enough is given to men to speak what they will."[1] No censorship on censorious tongues was exercised in the Edinburgh kirk-sessions, it seems, in Queen Mary's reign, and her Majesty lacked power to enforce the penalties decreed in the statutes "against leasing-making," however specially the "lees" might touch herself. Randolph communicates nothing worse than led the English Secretary to record in his diary, 16th July, "The Queen of Scots was married to the Lord Darnley at Holyrood House in secret the 9th of this month, and from thence went to the Lord Seton's house to bed."[2]

Seton is only a pleasant ride from Edinburgh, and the distance could well be accomplished in an hour by the fair

[1] Stevenson's Illustrations. [2] Ibid.

royal equestrian and her company. "Two nights she tarried there, and the next day came to her dinner to the Castle of Edinburgh; then was it said she would remain there. That afternoon she and my Lord Darnley walked up and down the town disguised until supper-time, and returned thither again, but lay that night in the Abbey. The next day, in like sort, she cometh after dinner upon her feet from the Abbey, the Lord Darnley leading her by one arm, and Fowler by the other. In that troop there were the Lady Erskine and old Lady Seton, the Earl of Lennox and Seignor David, with two or three others. These vagaries make men's tongues to chatter fast, in special where so great liberty is given them to speak what they list, or at the least so great occasion as this is that moveth them so to do."[1]

How circumspect and blameless the young Queen's conduct had been up to this date, is evident by the manner in which Randolph labours to make out that she had committed a most wonderful breach of propriety by taking a quiet walk, after her twelve o'clock dinner, through the streets of her metropolis, leaning on the arm of her cousin, Lord of Darnley, whose wife she was now pretty well known to be, and with whom she was to go through the ceremonial of a public marriage in the course of a few days. This promenade, too, was sanctioned by the presence of his father, the Earl of Lennox, her aunt's husband, old Lady Seton, and other noble ladies of her household. However distorted by the relation of an unfriendly witness, the fact is an indubitable proof both of the moral courage of Mary Stuart and her popularity, that, notwithstanding the recent insurrectionary demonstration of a fanatic faction in her metropolis, and while the rebel Lords were sounding the tocsin of revolt throughout the realm, she could walk on the causeway among her people, with no other defence than their unalienated affection for her person. But she and Darnley were disguised, Randolph affirms; and Cecil, in his abstract from the despatch of July 16th, writes, "The Queen and Lord Darnley walk

[1] Randolph to Cecil, July 16, 1565.

disguised in the streets."[1] If so, they chose an inappropriate season for their frolic; and even if it had been a murk All-hallowe'en, they could not have found any costume, however quaint and outlandish, that could have concealed the lofty height of Darnley and the majestic figure of the Queen. Far less could a pair so eminently distinguished for beauty and courtly grace have expected to walk up and down the Canongate in the bright light of a July afternoon, unrecognised, accompanied by such well-known personages as the Earl of Lennox and his English attendant, and, above all, the droll misshapen little Piedmontese Secretary, David Riccio. All the disguise, we should suppose, that was practised on this occasion by Queen Mary, was exchanging her regal frontlet and robes, which in those days a sovereign was never seen in public without, for a plain hood, and a dress more appropriate for a pedestrian expedition in the dirty streets of the old town of Edinburgh, than her sweeping garments of black velvet and silver tissue, her pearls and jewels. It has been shown that, in the commencement of this year, she dispensed with her canopy and chair of state, and all the inconvenient formalities of royalty during her sojourn in the merchant's at St Andrews, and now she ventured to prove how greatly her mind was in advance of the semi-barbarous tastes of the age, by appearing, for the first time, in the streets of Edinburgh, without forming the centre of a pageant procession, with the sword of state borne before her. This cumbrous pomp of royalty, like the imposing rites of heathen worship, was esteemed by the vulgar as part and parcel of a divinity to which their homage was due. Queen Elizabeth, who studied deeply for effect, was never known to move without it, except on one occasion—that of her incognita visit to Greenwich Fair—riding on a pillion behind her favourite Master of the Horse, Leicester; and then, being, like Mary, a person not formed to pass unnoticed in a crowd, she did not escape unrecognised. In France, Mary Stuart had been accustomed to reign as a woman, and the consciousness of the personal interest she had excited there made her

[1] Keith.

desirous of winning influence, in like manner, by her feminine charms and graceful manners, when called to occupy the seat of empire in her own realm, rather than to owe it to the importance of her position as a ruler. This delicacy of feeling made her too sensitive and romantic for the sordid worldlings among whom her lot was cast.

The dispute between the two Queens on the subject of the beardless Adonis, Darnley, was greatly aggravated by Lennox's man, Fowler, telling Mary "that Elizabeth had sent a herald to proclaim both the father and son traitors, at the market cross of one of the frontier towns in Scotland." Mary sent a haughty message to Randolph by Lethington, expressing her indignation at the Queen of England presuming to take so great a liberty in her realm. Randolph denied the charge with great heat, declaring "that it was a false saying of Fowler, whom, since the Queen of Scots had taken under her protection, he could not punish otherwise than by denouncing him to the world as villain and a liar, and speaking as much evil of him as he could."[1] The next day the matter was discussed between Mary and Randolph, when he, as the report was unfounded, took up a high tone, declaring "the injury was not small for the Queen his mistress to be thought so unadvised as to send a herald to proclaim her rebels traitors, in a strange country, at a market cross—a thing against order, against custom, and unadvisedly spoken by him who was the author thereof."

Mary was urged by Lennox and Darnley to send Randolph out of her realm at this juncture, and as long as he remained, to prohibit her subjects from holding the slightest intercourse with him. "No man," continues Randolph, "so cruel as my Lord Darnley to have me away." An instinct of self-preservation must have prompted the unfortunate Prince, as he had not seen the proofs of that unscrupulous statesman's confederacy with the murderous premeditators of his death.

Queen Mary told Randolph "that it would not be for her honour to put him under restraint, but she might treat him

[1] Stevenson's Illustrations, p. 122.

as coldly as she thought meet," mitigating this expression of her altered feelings towards him "with many good words."[1] Fresh altercation ensued, however, and many grievances were recounted by Mary, and not without some warmth. "I know," said she, "your mistress went about but to abuse me, and so was I warned out of France, and other parts; and when I found it so indeed, I thought I would no longer stay on her fair words, but, being free as she is, would stand to my own choice. Let her not be offended with my marriage, any more than I am with hers;[2] and for the rest, I will abide such fortune as God will send me. I know," added she, "that King Harry, in his testament, thought him (Darnley) worthy of more favour than is now showed him; but if he have disfavour for my cause, I will recompense it the best I may, and will seek that friendship I can, if injury be done unto him or me either." The ambassador, who knew Darnley was as much ignored in Henry VIII.'s will as Mary herself, dryly observed, "For that she spake of King Henry's testament, he thought her Grace knew not much of his mind, and that, whatever were its strength or value, neither of them could derive any great rights from thence; and whoever put that conceit into her head, did but deceive her, as, in the end, she would find." And strange indeed it was that Mary should have been no better informed of the real nature of a document of such importance, the contents of which must have been well known to so many persons of her own religion in England. Randolph told her "that, without the favour of the Queen his mistress, neither she nor the Lord Darnley could ever set foot within the realm of England;" adding, "that, in respect to friends, his mistress had more in her power than she might imagine."

"It must now be with me as it may be," said Mary, "and, I pray you, tell me what would the Queen, my good sister, that I should do?"[3] Randolph replied, "that he knew nothing she could do would be better than to send home the Lord of Lennox and Lord Darnley; then should the Queen

[1] Stevenson's Illustrations, p. 122.
[2] Elizabeth was then engaged in a matrimonial treaty with Charles IX.
[3] Stevenson's Illustrations, p. 122.

his mistress and she be friends, and her country in as good repose and quietness as before." "To send them home I may not," replied Mary. "Is there no other way than that?" "I know that would be the best," said Randolph; "but you have wise men about you, that might, peradventure, find somewhat else that might at least stay the present evil, and the rest might be gotten in time. What if your Majesty would alter your religion?" "What would that do?" asked Mary. "Peradventure," replied Randolph, "somewhat move her Majesty to allow the sooner of your marriage." "What!" exclaimed Mary, "would you that I should make merchandise of my religion, to frame myself to your ministers' wills? It cannot be so."[1]

Randolph observed, "that to know her duty to God, and frame her will to God's will, and the humble desire and prayer of her subjects and ministers of God's true word, was no making merchandise; and desired her to consider her estate in time, that the Queen his mistress were not forced, by her unkind dealing, to do that for honour's cause against her that she would be loth to attempt"—knowing full well that he had already secretly conveyed to the associate Lords, banded for rebellion against their Sovereign, assurances of Elizabeth's help and encouragement in their intended revolt. "I must," said Mary, "abide the worst; and yet I am loth to offend her, and so I would you should assure her." "The world is now grown too wise, and we ourselves become too fine and subtle," observed the sarcastic diplomatist, "to give great credit to words; and seeing the fail proceedeth from your Majesty's self, it must be repaired by some apparent deed." "You can never persuade me that I have failed to your mistress, but rather she to me," rejoined Mary; "and some incommodity it will be to her to lose my amity, as hers will be to me; and yet," added she, "I will refuse to do nothing that well I may."[2]

This conversation occupied about an hour, during which time Randolph scanned Queen Mary's countenance and manner intently, to penetrate what her real mind was, and plainly perceived that nothing offended her so much as reflec-

[1] Stevenson's Illustrations, p. 122. [2] Ibid.

tions in opposition to her marriage. "Counsel," continues he, "she taketh of no man but the Lord Lennox, his son, David, and the Lady Erskine. At this present, of her old counsellors, she hath in the Court only these, the Lord Erskine and Lord of Lethington: the one meddleth not; the other may do what he will, for neither he is, nor will be, of their council." After mentioning the seditious conventions of disaffected Congregationalists that were to meet at Perth and Glasgow, Randolph repeats "that their great trust was in Queen Elizabeth, and what pity it were if she should allow the great number of good friends she had in that realm to be overthrown, and that the Papists misliked Queen Mary's government and proceedings as much as the Protestants"[1]—as in truth they had cause, for all state offices, patronage, and preferment had been given, from motives of policy, to preserve the peace of the realm, to her Protestant nobles. With Scottish subjects of her own religion she had had nothing in common but her creed, and all the favour she had shown them was an occasional attempt, not always successful, to obtain for them liberty of worship and personal protection from the persecuting zeal of the ultra-fanatic party.

On the 17th of July, Mary wrote separate letters to her Reformed Lords, to certify them that she had no intention of disturbing the religion she found established on her return from France; and reminded them, "that, as she had always kept good faith with them, she expected them to assist her in preserving the peace of the realm, now threatened by seditious and evil-disposed persons." She also issued her royal summonses to such of her peers and manorial nobility as she knew she could depend on, to convene in Edinburgh to her aid, with their servants and vassals in warlike array, bringing fifteen days' provisions with them. Her appeal was so well responded to that in three days' time she found herself surrounded by such a body of feudal militia, and their chiefs, as to banish all fear of the evil designs of her adversaries.[2] The conspiracy of Moray and his confede-

[1] Stevenson's Illustrations, p. 122.
[2] Robertson; Knox; Keith; Tytler; Randolph.

rates to seize her person, her spirited demeanour and romantic escape, had kindled a glow of loyal enthusiasm in the true hearts of Scotland; both gentles and commons were eager to band in her defence. So far was Mary at this time from "having fallen," as Randolph pretends, "into universal contempt and misliking of her subjects," that she received every token of their affection and reverence that the best-beloved Sovereign could expect, when menaced by a traitorous faction at home leagued with a powerful neighbour abroad. The man would have been esteemed a dastard, and the slave of England, who had not come to her summons in her hour of need, and professed his willingness to do or die in her cause. "I must say," writes Randolph, "that she is so much altered from that majesty that I have seen in her, and that modesty that I have wondered to be in her, that she is not now counted, by her own subjects, to be the woman that she was."[1] Little did he who penned this passage imagine the inestimable service he was rendering to the reputation of Mary Stuart, by the refutation it affords to the libellous aspersions which the prejudice of Knox against her religion induced that powerful and popular organ of her foes to cast on her queenly dignity and feminine purity. What becomes of his accusations of personal indecorum with Chastelar?—what of Buchanan's base insinuations regarding Riccio, and the charge of levity with which party writers have attempted to defame her character? Randolph, who had seen her almost every day for four years, from the time when she arrived a beauteous widow of eighteen from France, up to the period of her marriage with Darnley, and had heard the worst that could be said of her by blind fanaticism and political falsehood—who, by his intimacy with Mary Beton, had full and unsuspected means of knowing what her conduct in her most private moments was,—he "had wondered at the majesty and modesty he had remarked in her." What are the eulogiums of Brantôme, Caussin, Belforest, and the rest of her adoring panegyrists, in comparison to

[1] Randolph to Cecil, July 19, 1565—State Paper Office MS.

the testimony of this unfriendly witness of the majesty and modesty of Mary Stuart's deportment during her widow reign in Scotland?

"She is so poor at present," continues Randolph in his detracting vein,[1] "that ready money she hath very little, credit none at all, friendship with few; both she and her husband (so I may now well call him) so high-hearted that they think themselves equal to the greatest, and able to attain, in time, unto whatsoever they desire. To let the world understand that the Lords have some other pretence than religion, she seemeth now willing to make no alteration of religion, and thinketh that way to make the Protestants the more odious to the rest; but she herself altereth nothing of her accustomed sort. And because my Lord Darnley would seem to be indifferent, sometimes he goeth with the Queen to mass, and these two days he hath been at the sermons. It is also said that she will be married with a minister, whereof I do doubt. Some think, that though the bruit be that she shall be married upon Sunday come eight days, that it shall be *prevented*"—(here Randolph uses this word in its true and original sense, anticipated), "and be upon Sunday next, before this company that be here do break. Your Honour may see how her promise is kept to the Queen's Majesty, that her marriage should be deferred for three months, and nothing done therein before the Parliament, which is now prorogued to the first of September. These matters are guided by my Lord of Lennox, Lord Robert (Mary's brother), and David. Other counsel she taketh little of any subject she hath. Mr John Hay is sent to declare unto my Lord Moray, the Lord of Lennox and Lord Darnley's good-will towards him, and to purge them that ever any of them were consenting to have slain him, as was reported; and in that quarrel, my Lord of Lennox doth offer to fight with whomsoever dare avow it."[2]

The challenge was not accepted by Moray or any of his friends; neither would he, as already mentioned, consent to subject his allegation to the test of a judicial investiga-

[1] Randolph to Cecil, July 19, 1565—Keith. [2] Ibid.

tion. It was evidently a paltry pretext, devised as an excuse for his hostile demeanour against his Sovereign. Popular opinion being now greatly in Mary's favour, the associate Lords, instead of finding themselves in a position to compel her to break her engagement with Darnley, retired to Stirling, where they held a convention of their friends, and received fresh encouragement from the Queen of England to persevere in their disloyal demonstrations. Under all these provocations, Mary conducted herself with moderation and courtesy towards them. She was a peace Sovereign, and spared no effort to preserve her realm from the miseries of a civil war;[1] and she made a last effort to conciliate Moray and his allies. "A few days only before the celebration of my marriage," she writes,[2] "I sent to entreat them to come to it themselves; but they excused themselves, making protestations that they would assemble themselves to defend their lives and properties, and prevent the usurped mastery of the King my husband; and, not content with that, they put forth proclamations, saying all they could to make me odious to my subjects. Such is the obedience they have paid me—such the manner in which they have conducted themselves towards me."

It was at this juncture, when the tocsin of revolt was resounding through her realm, that Mary Stuart, in evil hour, decided on fortifying her party by the recall of that powerful Border chief, the Earl of Bothwell, from his long exile.[3] Perhaps the audacious falsehoods asserted by Moray of Darnley and Lennox had had the effect of inducing the Queen to believe that she had given credence too easily to the charge against Bothwell, for which he had, untried, suffered imprisonment, and on account of his escape from that irksome, and, as she might now think, unjust restraint, outlawry, confiscation of his property, and exile. Not only as a matter of political expediency, but from a sense of moral justice, under such circumstances, Mary, as his Sovereign, acted properly in restoring this nobleman to his

[1] Randolph; Keith; Chalmers; Tytler.

[2] Letter from Queen Mary to de Foix, the French ambassador in London, Nov. 8, 1565—Labanoff, vol. i.

[3] Randolph to Cecil July 19, 1565.

country, and endeavouring to make him some amends for the loss of his rents and the spoil of his goods. As it was impossible to ask the parties who had been benefited by his losses to refund their gains, Mary promised to give him compensation out of the Church property, which unhappily was vested in the trusteeship of the Crown.

Mary gave audience, July 21, to Randolph, who came to offer a dictatorial message on the part of the English Sovereign, advising her not to take up arms against the Earl of Moray and the other Lords, now associates in an insurrectionary movement. The affectionate terms in which Elizabeth had spoken of these may be gathered from Mary's reply. "For those whom your mistress calls 'my *best* subjects,' I cannot esteem them so, nor so do they deserve to be accounted of that will not obey my commands; and therefore my good sister ought not to be offended if I do that against them as they deserve." Randolph begged her to consider from what source the advice came, and boldly, in the face of their acts, enlarged on the duty and obedience of the insurgents, the miseries that might ensue, and the danger to her own person, if she rejected good advice. Mary was not to be intimidated. "For all these things," said she, "I have remedy enough, and will never esteem them good subjects that will act so contrary to my will as they do." Randolph then proceeded to reiterate to Lennox and Darnley the Queen of England's mandate for their return. Lennox declined doing so, on account of the hard usage of his wife; observing, that "since her Majesty pleased not to accept his letters of humble submission, it would be too dangerous for him to return, unless assured she would be gracious to him; but he was quite ready to do her all the service that lawfully he now might."[1] Darnley spoke in loftier tone, and to more decided purpose. "I do now," said he, "acknowledge no other duty or obedience but to the Queen here, whom I serve and honour; and seeing that the other, *your* mistress, is so envious of my good fortune, I doubt not but she [Queen Mary] may have need of me, as you shall know within a few days;

[1] Randolph to Cecil, July 21, 1565.

wherefore, to return I intend not. I find myself very well where I am, and so purpose to keep me; and this shall be for your answer." [1] Randolph told him "that he had much forgotten his duty, to esteem so lightly such a Princess as the Queen his mistress was, and in such despiteful words to give over his allegiance to her was not discreetly spoken of him, and that he (Randolph) hoped to see the wreck and overthrow of as many as were of the same mind;" and so, turning his back on him, departed without reverence or farewell. Darnley, according to the presumption of his age and character, boasted "that he and the Queen of Scots had so strong a party in England that Queen Elizabeth had more cause to be in fear of them than they of her, and that he would like nothing better than the opportunity of leading an invasion into the northern counties;" adding, with still greater imprudence, "that he cared more for the Papists in England than for the Protestants in Scotland."

The consent of the King and Queen-mother of France to Mary's second marriage, privately obtained in April, was now given in due form, couched in these gratifying terms: "That since it was not the will of God for her to be the consort of the Duke of Anjou, their Majesties could see no objection to her matching herself with her kinsman Lord Darnley, who was much more acceptable to them than the Archduke Charles or the Prince of Spain." "Judge if I was not welcome to the lovers when I returned with this message," [2] observes the ambassador.

Unawed by the threats of Elizabeth and the rebellious attitude of her brother Moray and his faction, Queen Mary proceeded to gratify the man she delighted to honour with the royal title of Duke of Albany, and to order the proclamation of their banns by the reformed minister of the parish. Neither the exalted rank of the fair Sovereign of the realm, nor her difference of religion, excused her from this homely ceremonial. It was the law of the land, and she showed her good sense in submitting to it. Randolph tells Cecil, the day before the proclamation was made, that he sends him a copy of the order: this he, of

[1] Randolph to Cecil, July 21, 1565. [2] Memoirs de Castelnau.

course, obtained of the Justice-Clerk, Bellenden, by whom the original document was written. This order is still preserved in the Book of the Kirk of the Canongait—one of the oldest and most curious of those quaint registers extant. It may not be displeasing to the readers of Mary's biography to see the form in which the mandate for the Protestant legalisation of her fatal nuptials with her English cousin was given:—

"The 21 of Julij, anno Domini 1565. The quhilk day Johne Brand, mynister, presentit to the kirk ane writing, writt by the Justice-Clark hand, desiring the kirk of the Cannogait, and mynister thereof, to proclaim Harie Duk of Albany, erle of Roise, on the one parte, and Marie, by the grace of God, Quene of Scottis, Soverane of this realm, on the other parte. The quhilk ordains the mynister to do of the name of God."

Two things are remarkable: first, that the order for the publication of these banns was issued before the arrival of the Pope's dispensation for the marriage, which Chisholm, Bishop of Dunblane, brought to Edinburgh on the 22d of July, on which day, being Sunday, the proclamation was made in the church of the Canongate; and, secondly, that Darnley was described by the style and title of Henry Duke of Albany, whereas his creation did not take place till the 23d. He was invested with great triumph by Mary with his ducal robe and coronet on that day, as the preliminary step to the honour of receiving her hand, in the presence of the nobles of Scotland.

The royal dukedom of Albany did not content Darnley. Nothing less than the title of King would satisfy his presumption. Mary was willing to call him so herself, and that he should be treated as such in her palace; but he required to be given regal style and title by public proclamation. Mary hesitated to stretch her prerogative so far, in the face of a threatened insurrection. She implored him to have patience, and it should be done at a more auspicious opportunity, and in a legal and proper manner; "entreating him to wait till he should have completed his twenty-first year; that, in the mean time, matters might be put in such

a train as to secure the consent of the Estates of Scotland."[1] But her reasoning and persuasions were alike ineffectual; he had made the demand, and would not recede from his purpose; acting according to the spirit of his family motto, "*Avant Darnley—Jamais darrière.*" As Mary had already taken the irrevocable step of promising wifely obedience to this intractable and selfish young man, she found herself under the painful necessity of submitting her better judgment to his wilfulness. She was, withal, under the tutelage of the ambitious and unprincipled Earl of Lennox, whose long-cherished views on the throne of Scotland were to be gratified on this occasion in the person of his son.

It was not till after sunset on Saturday the 28th of July, the day before the public solemnisation of her marriage, that Mary Stuart was induced to commit the false step of signing and executing a warrant, commanding her Lord Lyon King of Arms, and his brother heralds, to proclaim Henry, Duke of Albany, King of Scotland, by her own authority, in virtue of the bond of matrimony which was to be solemnised and completed in the face of holy kirk, between her and the said illustrious Prince, on the following day, when he was to receive that title; and all writs and letters were from that time to be made in their joint names, as King and Queen of Scotland conjointly.[2] This proclamation was made about nine in the evening at the Abbey gates and the Market Cross, with sound of trumpet; and thus the secret-service men of England, then about to advance their rebel banners against their liege lady, were furnished with a tangible cause for their hostile proceedings.

Mary having appointed the unusually early hour of six in the morning of Sunday, July 29th, for the public solemnisation of her nuptials, she was, at half-past five, led from her chamber, between the Earls of Lennox and Atholl, into the Chapel-royal of Holyrood, attended by her ladies and all the loyally disposed nobles of Scotland. She was received by Henry Sinclair, Dean of Restalrig, Bishop of

[1] Randolph to Cecil, July 31, 1565—Robertson's Appendix.
[2] The warrant is printed at full length in Keith, p. 306.

Brechin, and his assistants, and there reposed herself while the Earls of Lennox and Atholl went to fetch the bridegroom, who was in like manner conducted by them in procession to the bridal altar, and received by the officiating priests. The banns previously published by the Protestant minister, Brand, in the parish church of the Canongate, were then proclaimed, for the third time, in the presence of the illustrious pair. A certificate was taken by a notary that no man objected to them, or alleged any cause why the marriage might not proceed. This document was subscribed by both in the regal style, Henry and Marie R. This done, the religious ceremony commenced according to the ritual of the Church of Rome. The words were spoken; the rings, which were three, the middle one a rich diamond, were consecrated, and placed on the finger of the regal bride. The prayers were said, the nuptial benediction pronounced, and Henry, Duke of Albany, and Mary, Sovereign Lady of Scotland and the Isles, were declared man and wife, duly and lawfully married in the presence of God and that congregation.[1]

"Te Deum laudamus—it is done, and cannot now be broken!" was the exultant exclamation of Mary's lively little Piedmontese secretary, David Riccio, in response to the thrilling echo of the long Amen that pealed through the stately aisles of Holyrood Chapel at the conclusion of the spousal rites;[2] for well was he aware of the informality of the private marriage between the princely cousins, which had been plighted three months before at Stirling in his chamber, without the Papal license to sanction such near relatives in contracting wedlock with each other. Poor David, whom Melville terms "a pleasant *fallow*," had truly performed the part of the bridegroom's friend, on this occasion, by rejoicing vehemently in his joy, and deserved not the payment it was his hard lot to receive from the fickle and ungrateful boy-husband of Mary Stuart.

The entry of this marriage is preserved in the Register

[1] Randolph to Leicester, July 29, 1565.

[2] Italian Memorial in the Medici Archives, printed in Labanoff's Appendix, vol. vii.

Book of the Church of the Canongait in this quaint form, dated July 29, 1565: "Henry, Duk of Albany, Erll of Rois, Marie be the grace of God Quene, Soverane of this realme, 1—2—3. Married in the Chapell of Halyruid." The figures denote the first, second, and third times of asking, familiarly called publishing the banns. In the Register of Marriages of the Cannongait, under the same date, is entered, "Henry and Marie, Kyng and Qweine of Scotis."[1]

As the Popery of Darnley was the ostensible objection of Mary's Protestant subjects to this otherwise politic alliance, he made an artful attempt to mask his real sentiments by eschewing the mass which followed his spousal rites. Before the commencement of that service, so obligatory to members of the Roman Church, he kissed his royal Consort and retired with the Protestant Lords, as if he had become a convert to their opinions and a partaker in their scruples, leaving Mary, and the Roman Catholic division of the assistants at their bridal, to hear it without him.[2]

By some it was regarded as an inauspicious portent for this marriage, that Mary plighted her nuptial vows to Darnley in the sable weeds she wore for her first husband, Francis de Valois. "She had upon her back," says Randolph, "the great mourning gown of black with the great wide mourning hood, not unlike unto that which she wore the doleful day of the burial of her husband."[3] This was the dress of a widowed Queen of France, and the royal etiquette of the period rendered it imperative for Mary to appear in it on all state occasions, till she was actually the wife of her second husband. It was not even then to be resigned without a decent semblance of reluctance, and a coquettish struggle for its retention by a re-wedded widow. In compliance with this old-established custom, as soon as the mass was over, and the royal bride was led back to her own chamber, her youthful bridegroom, who was waiting to receive her there with the rest of her nobles, made earnest

[1] These discoveries were made by that learned and indefatigable antiquary, John Riddell, Esq., of the Faculty of Advocates.
[2] Randolph to Leicester, July 31, 1565. Wright. Ellis's Royal Letters.
[3] Ibid.

suit to her "that she should cast off her care, lay aside those sorrowful garments, and dispose herself to a pleasanter life." Mary, of course, objected; "but after some pretty refusal, more for the fashion's sake than grief of heart, she suffered them that stood by, every man that could approach, to take out a pin; and so being committed to her ladies, changed her garments," and put on her bridal robes. Dancing succeeded, and royal cheer. The Queen and her consort were conducted to their dinner by all the nobles not in open rebellion. The trumpets sounded, and money was thrown to the people in greater abundance than was consistent with the poverty of the bridegroom and the empty exchequer of the august bride. Silver and gold were forthcoming for this purpose, nevertheless, and Largesse was cried in acknowledgment of their bounty. Mary and her consort sat together at the table, but the place of honour was occupied by her. She was served by three earls, Atholl and Morton being her carvers, Crawford her cup-bearer. Eglinton and Cassillis carved for Darnley. Glencairn, who had been loud in opposition to "this Popish husband for their Queen," and was even then secretly leagued with the rebel Lords, whom he openly joined within the week, was his cup-bearer.[1]

After dinner the royal pair rose to dance, and then retired to enjoy the better entertainment of a *tête-à-tête* till supper. The like ceremonies were repeated at that meal as at dinner, and the evening closed with dancing. Mary waived all private feelings on the score of Randolph's contemptuous treatment of Darnley, and invited him to the evening entertainment, in his public character as representative of the Queen of England. "But, like a currish or uncourteous carle," he says, "I refused to be there;" adding, "that it may be supposed he had some desire to see his mistress (Mary Beton), of whom he had not gotten sight for eighteen days."[2]

Instead of the acclamations usual on such occasions, a tumult took place, which lasted all night; and the royal bride

[1] Chalmers. Robertson's Appendix.
[2] Randolph to Leicester, July 31, 1565.

found herself under the necessity, at an early hour the next morning, of summoning the principal burgesses and magistrates into her presence, to inquire the cause of the riot. She exhibited no signs of anger, but wisely endeavoured to soothe the irritation, which she suspected to arise from the natural apprehensions excited by her marriage with a Roman Catholic prince. She took that opportunity of repeating to them her reply to the demands which had been made to her by her Protestant subjects, and this she did in the mildest and most persuasive words she could devise. "I cannot," said she, "comply with your desire that I should abandon the mass, having been brought up in the Catholic faith, which I esteem to be a thing so holy and pleasing in the sight of God that I could not leave it without great scruples of conscience; nor ought my conscience to be forced in such matter, any more than yours. I therefore entreat you, as you have full liberty for the exercise of your religion, to be content with that, and allow me the same privilege. And again, as you have full security for your lives and properties without any vexation from me, why should you not grant me the like? As for the other things you demand of me, they are not in my power to accord, but must be submitted to the decision of the Estates of Scotland, which I propose shortly to convene. In the mean time, you may be assured I will be advised on whatever is requisite for your weal, and that of my realm; and, as far as in me lies, I will strive to do whatever appears for the best." With this assurance they all declared themselves satisfied, and the tumult was appeased. So true it is that a soft answer turneth away wrath.

The same day, at twelve o'clock, Mary caused her husband to be again proclaimed King of Scotland, in the presence of all the Lords who had attended the solemnisation of the marriage; but not one of them said Amen, except his father, who with a loud voice cried out, "God save his Grace."[1]

It was regarded by the nobles as an illegal stretch of her prerogative that Mary should have conferred the title of

[1] Randolph to Cecil, July 31.

King on her husband; and he being a minor, doubts were started whether any of their mutual acts could be considered valid. Her consort's behaviour, when he had been married only two days, is thus described by Randolph: "His words to all men against whom he conceiveth any displeasure, how unjust soever it is, be so proud and spiteful, that rather he seemeth a monarch of the world than he that not long since we have seen and known as the Lord Darnley. He looketh now for reverence to be given him, and some there be that think him little worthy of it." A lively picture of the conjugal devotion of the royal bride, and her submission to the unreasonable wishes and demands of the inconsiderate young despot, to whom in evil hour she had linked her destiny, follows from the same graphic pen: "All honour that may be attributed unto any man by a wife, he hath it wholly and fully. All praise that may be spoken of him, he lacketh not from herself. All dignities that she can indue him with are already given and granted. No man pleaseth her that contenteth not him; and what may I say more? She hath given over unto him her whole will, to be ruled and guided as himself best liketh." In illustration of the indocile disposition of the hopeful helpmate Mary had been for nearly four months endeavouring to mould to the wishes of her subjects, Randolph emphatically observes to Leicester, "She can as much prevail with him in anything that is against his will as your lordship may with me, to persuade that I should hang myself. This last dignity out of hand, to have him proclaimed King, she would have had it deferred until it were agreed by Parliament, or had been himself of twenty-one years of age, that things done in his name might have better authority. He would in no case have it deferred one day, and either then or never." The great consideration with which Mary treated her youthful consort is confirmed by the testimony of Sir James Melville: "After that the Queen's Majesty had married my Lord Darnley, she did him great honour herself, and willed every one that would deserve her favour to do the like, and to wait upon him, so that he was well accompanied; and such as

suited him, or by him, for a while, came best speed of their errands."[1]

David Riccio received, by the King and Queen's precept, August 1st, the third day after their marriage, a piece of black taffaty worth £5, 4s., and black satin worth £6; and on the 24th of the same month, money to purchase a new bed and hangings.[2] All the pecuniary arrangements of the Queen for supplying the table and privy-purse expenses of her secretly-wedded husband had been managed with prudence and fidelity by this active little foreigner, their mutual confidant and factotum. Much jealousy was excited by the great favour and consideration with which he was treated by the royal pair, and it was generally reported that he was a pensioner of the Pope, and minded to do all he could for the interests of his own religion; and this was probably true.[3]

The Muses of the north were not silent on a subject of such great poetic interest as the love-match of Scotland's Queen and loveliest woman with her handsome English cousin, the graces and accomplishments of the illustrious pair, and the lofty expectations of the anticipated fruit of their marriage and united claims on the English succession. The bridal epithalamium on Mary Stuart's second marriage, by Thomas Craignum, was printed in a small volume by Robert Lekprevick of Edinburgh. Buchanan also commemorated his royal patroness's second nuptials in one of his adulatory poems, called "The Pomp of the Gods," in which he speaks of her "five Maries." The number of the original four—Mary Beton, Mary Seton, Mary Fleming, and Mary Livingstone—had been reduced to three by the marriage of the latter to John Sempill; but two new Maries had been added to the fair sisterhood.

No honeymoon of idle joyaunce—no princely festivities, like those which marked the celebration of Mary Stuart's nuptials with the Dauphin, Francis de Valois—followed her second marriage. Knox, indeed, affirms "that for

[1] Sir James Melville's Memoirs.
[2] Treasury Records, Register House, Edinburgh.
[3] Sir James Melville's Memoirs.

four days there was nothing but balling, dancing, and banqueting." Yet, even by his own account, business of sterner import occupied the attention of the royal pair, and ruder notes than those of the harp and viol composed their bridal music. "The Earl of Rothes, the Laird of Grange, with some other gentlemen of Fife, were put to the horn for non-appearance, and immediately the swash, tabron, and drums were stricken and beaten for men of war to serve the King and Queen's Majesty, and to take their pay. This sudden and hasty creation of Kings moved the hearts of a great number; now among the people were divers bruits, for some alleged that the cause of this alteration was not for religion, but rather for hatred, envy of sudden promotion, and the like."[1] Moray and Argyll also being summoned, and refusing to appear, were in like manner denounced as rebels and put to the horn, whereupon they and their confederates retired into Argyllshire, and sent their envoy, Nicholas Elphinstone, to demand immediate aid of the Queen of England. Regardless of the sacred character of an ambassador, Randolph not only acted as the inciter of the rebellion, but, as the agent of the traitors who were plotting to bring the destroying horrors of an English invasion upon their native land, he urges Leicester to use his influence with his Sovereign to contribute both men and money for this object. Mark how he identifies himself with them: "Greater honour her Majesty cannot have than in that which lieth in her power to do for us. The sums are not great, the numbers of men are not many, that we desire. Many will daily be found, though this will be some charge. Her friends here" (Moray and his faction) "being once taken away, where will her Majesty find the like?"[2]

Queen Mary was sensible of the necessity of strengthening her party by the restoration of several powerful nobles who had been ruined, disgraced, imprisoned, or driven into exile during Moray's administration. These were the Earl of Sutherland, the young Lord Gordon, son

[1] History of the Reformation in Scotland, vol. ii. p. 4
[2] Wright's Elizabeth and her Times, vol. i. p. 200.

of the late unfortunate Earl of Huntley, his brethren, and the Earl of Bothwell. The last Randolph styles "enemy of all honest men." But however deserving of censure, he had resisted every temptation either to act as the secret-service man of England, or to trouble Queen Mary's government by raising a revolt against her in Liddesdale, during his imprisonment at Berwick, which he might well have done; his forbearance was deservedly appreciated by his Sovereign, and she now issued a mandate for his recall. Whether he distrusted the good faith in which the royal grace was offered, or for some private reason of his own delayed his return to Scotland, it is certain that he was in no haste to avail himself of the permission he had so often solicited in vain.

In honour of her marriage, Queen Mary performed a tardy act of justice, by releasing the heir of Huntley from the durance in which he had lain for nearly three years in Dunbar Castle, with the sentence of death hanging over his head. The circumstances are thus quaintly chronicled by a contemporary pen: "The first day of August the said George, Lord Gordon gave presence to the King and Queen in the Palace of Holyrood House, where he was gently entertained by them."[1] Two days later, "he was, by open proclamation at the Market Cross of Edinburgh by the Sovereign's heralds, released from the process of the horn (outlawry), and received to peace, with licence and tolerance to resort, pass, and repass wheresoever he might please in any part of the realm. He was soon after restored to his fame, honour, and dignity, and to the Lordship of Gordon;" and in the October following, to the Earldom of Huntley and all his late father's estates and honours.[2] The wheel of fortune had revolved; his vindictive persecutor, Moray, was no longer the director of the power of the Crown of Scotland, and the Queen acted according to the natural impulses of her generous nature.

In the midst of these changes and agitations in Queen Mary's court and realm, the Queen of England thought proper to send Mr Tamworth, of her Privy Chamber, with

[1] Diurnal of Occurrents. [2] Ibid.

a very offensive letter of remonstrance on the impropriety of which she had been guilty in marrying her subject. Mary having received a secret intimation that Tamworth was instructed neither to treat Darnley as King of Scotland, nor even with the respect due to her husband, refused to admit him into her presence, but desired him to communicate his message in writing. This he did; and Mary replied, in the same manner, "that she had given the Queen of England no reasonable cause of offence; on the contrary, she had condescended to her desire, by refusing several great foreign princes, and marrying, as her Majesty had requested, an English subject—one, too, who, from his near relationship to them both, would not disparage her dignity." In regard to the impertinent interference of Elizabeth between her and her subjects, and her insinuated threats touching the English succession, she added, "I am not so lowly born, nor have I such small alliances abroad, that, if compelled by your mistress to enter into pactions with foreign powers, she shall find them of such small account as she believes. The place I fill in relation to the succession to the Crown of England is no vain or imaginary one; as by God's grace it shall be seen." [1]

In regard to Elizabeth's demands for sending home Lennox and Darnley, being English subjects, Mary observed "that it seemed strange she might not enjoy the company of one whom God and the laws had made one with herself; and that Lennox, being a native Scotch Earl, whom she had restored at her good sister's request, was her own subject, and she could not be deprived of the liberty of retaining him." But as she desired earnestly to preserve friendly relations with her good sister, Mary promised on her royal word "that neither she nor her husband would attempt anything prejudicial to the Queen of England, either by foreign treaties, harbouring fugitives, or in any other way; that they would make such alliances as she desired; and in the event of succeeding to the Crown of England, would engage to preserve the religion at present established, as well as the laws and liberties of the realm, provided

[1] Keith. Tytler. State Paper Records.

Elizabeth would allow the succession to be secured to them by act of Parliament, in event of her having no lawful issue of her own; or in default of them, to Margaret, Countess of Lennox."[1]

As to Moray, his royal friend and patroness of England, his unfailing banker in time of need, for factious purposes, expresses "her hope that the Queen Mary will not prove herself so inconstant as to persecute him whom deservedly she had *so dearly loved*, lest also fear should constrain him to pursue such means for the preservation of his life as might be dangerous to the commonwealth." The bearer of this remonstrance in Moray's favour was, with the co-operation of Randolph, Elizabeth's agent, at that very time employed in disbursing her secret-service money to assist the ungrateful traitor whom his royal sister had so dearly loved, and fatally trusted, to plunge his native land into the horrors of civil war. And why? Because Mary, after a lengthened widowhood, had exercised her privilege of wedding a husband, for the sake of averting the succession war that threatened Scotland in the event of her dying without posterity. "Touching the Lord Moray," Mary haughtily replied "that she requested the Queen of England not to mix herself up with his cause, nor to interfere between her and any other of her subjects;" observing, "that, in refraining from such practices, her Majesty would perform the duty of a good neighbour, and it would be reciprocated." Mary added, "that she thought she might, with greater propriety, intercede for her mother-in-law, the Lady Margaret, whom she wished to have restored to her liberty, seeing she had done nothing contrary to justice and honour."

From de Foix's despatches we also learn, that when, directed by his own Sovereign to expostulate with Elizabeth on her opposition to Mary Stuart's marriage with Darnley, he told her "that his master thought it could do her no harm, and that there was every reason to expect she should show courtesy and kindness in the matter, since he

[1] Keith. Tytler. State Paper Records.

was nearly related to her through his mother the Lady Margaret Douglas, and aunt to her Majesty," Elizabeth, with equal disregard either to feminine delicacy or the honour of her family, replied, "I know he is my relation, but it is only by bastardy."[1]

Mary, so far from having lowered her political importance by her marriage, excited Elizabeth's jealous apprehensions that she had placed herself in a position to contest the Crown of England with her during her life; for, in the memorial on the causes of offence she had received from the Queen of Scots, presented by Walsingham, in her name, to the King of France, in 1570, Elizabeth expressly states "that the said Darnley, immediately on his marriage with the Queen of Scots, commenced a treasonable correspondence with divers of her subjects, for the purpose of exciting a sedition in her realm, and deposing her from her government."[2] As Elizabeth had imprisoned his mother and brother, and was supplying Moray and the rebel Lords with money, Darnley can scarcely be blamed for his proceedings. Nothing but his want of conduct prevented him from being a much more formidable accession to his consort's game than the chess-pawn to which Elizabeth compared him.[3]

Contrary to her usual munificence, Mary gave no presents to Tamworth, nor showed him any mark of respect. He was the bearer of money to the rebel Lords, which he transmitted to them through the agency of Lady Moray, who gave her ticket to the bearer, Johnstone, as an acknowledgment of the safe receipt of the bags of gold.[4] Hitherto this lady had been allowed by the Queen to remain undisturbed with her family at St Andrews, where she intended to lie in; but when the above transaction was discovered, her Majesty put the penalties of confiscation lately denounced against Moray into execution, and Lady Moray took refuge with their English friends at Berwick. Tamworth,

[1] De Foix's Despatches.
[2] Privy Council Letter-book, MS., in possession of Dr O'Callaghan.
[3] De Foix's Despatches.
[4] See the proceedings in the Maitland Miscellany.

not imagining his tricks had been discovered, assumed a lofty tone of independence, and refused to accept a passport because it bore the regal signature of Henry as well as Marie; consequently he was stopped at Dunbar on his homeward route, and carried by Lord Home to his castle, where he remained for several days.[1]

The insurgent Lords appeared in warlike array at Ayr on the 15th of August, and Queen Mary told Randolph "that unless he would promise, on his honour, not to meddle with her rebels, she should be under the necessity of placing a guard round his house." Simultaneously with the hostile demonstration of the insurgents, a fracas took place in Edinburgh between a party of the feudal militia and the townspeople, in which blood was drawn. "Their King," observes the Earl of Bedford sarcastically, "was putting on his armour to have parted the fray, but did not; or if he did, came not abroad. He loseth many of his friends daily, who, seeing his government, lean to the other party. The Queen getteth as many to her mass, and never were there so many as now there were at it on Sunday last."[2]

Darnley, who, like his father, and probably acting by his advice, occasionally made his Popish principles bend to his political interests, and was minded to play the popular, went in state on the following Sunday, August 19, to the High Kirk of Edinburgh to hear John Knox preach, a throne having been erected on purpose for his accommodation. Knox could not resist the opportunity of making a most offensive personal attack on his Majesty in the face of the whole congregation, coupled with still coarser and more insulting language of the Queen—taking for his text these words from the six-and-twentieth chapter of Isaiah, "O Lord our God, other lords than thou have ruled over us." By way of illustrating this portion of Scripture, Knox took occasion to speak of the government of wicked princes, "who, for the sins of the people, are sent as tyrants and scourges to plague them."[3] Among other things, he said "that God set in that room, for the offences and sins of the

[1] Keith; Tytler; Chalmers. [2] Wright's Elizabeth and her Times, vol. i.
[3] Knox, Hist. Ref. Scot., vol. ii. p. 497.

people, boys and women," and some other "words which appeared bitter in the King's ears, as that God justly punished Ahab and his posterity, because he would not take order with that harlot Jezebel." Darnley must have been less than man to hear such expressions applied to his Queen and wife without indignation. The length of the sermon, which detained him an hour and more "longer than the time appointed, aggravated his displeasure, and so commoved him that he would not dine; and being troubled with great fury, he past in the afternoon to the hawking."[1] The Queen had borne from Knox's lips comparisons no less odious, seeing he had, to her very face, likened her to Herod and Herodias's daughter, to Nebuchadnezzar, and to Nero, besides many offensive reproaches on her sex, without inflicting the slightest punishment on him; but Darnley being of a different temper, Knox was instantly summoned before the Council. He came, accompanied, as usual, by a great number of his followers, and some of the leading men in Edinburgh. Darnley, being at the head of a powerful gathering of the feudal militia, was not intimidated by burghers and preachers; the Secretary, Lethington, was ordered to inform Knox "that the King's Majesty was offended with some words in his sermon, and desired him to abstain from preaching for fifteen or twenty days, and let Master Craig supply his place."[2] It was easier to suspend Knox than to silence him, for he boldly replied, "that he had spoken nothing but according to his text; and as the King had, to pleasure the Queen, gone to mass, and dishonoured the Lord God, so should God, in His justice, make her an instrument of his ruin." On hearing this incendiary speech addressed to her husband in her very presence, Mary burst into a passionate fit of weeping; "and so," continues our author, who, be it remembered, is telling his own story in the third person, "to please her, John Knox must abstain from preaching for a time."

[1] Knox, Hist. Ref. Scot., vol. ii. p. 497.

[2] The Diurnal of Occurrents gives the following quaint and pithy version of the incident: "Upon the xix day of August the King came to St Giles' Church to the preaching, and John Knox preachit, whereat he was crabbit, and caused discharge the said John of his preachings."—P. 81.

Light punishment for an offence so gross, and perfectly unprovoked on the part of the Queen. Knox had given her sufficient handle for dealing with him according to the despotic severity of martial law. She was now at the head of a military force, surrounded by chiefs devoted to her cause, and who, regarding Knox as one of the great agitators and inciters to rebellion, would scarcely have scrupled to execute any sentence she might have decreed; and assuredly, if Mary had been of the vindictive temper he has painted her, he would not have escaped this time unscathed.

Darnley had excited the indignation of Knox by contemptuously casting into the fire a copy of the newly-set-forth version of the Book of Psalms;[1] an action no less rash than unbecoming, for however the refined taste of the youthful poet might be offended by the rudeness of the metre, and his classical pedantry by the ungrammatical language in which the sublime inspirations of the royal bard of Israel are crippled in that homely attempt to adapt them for congregational singing, he ought not to have violated the reverence due to holy writ, in whatsoever form it might be presented to him.

In a far different spirit had Mary acted when Buchanan dedicated his Latin version of the Psalms of David to her, in an elegant poem composed in the same learned language, of which he was so able a master. The delicate epigrammatic play on such of the words as bear a double meaning must, of course, suffer in a translation; but as the fluent pen of this celebrated writer was the great literary organ subsequently employed by Moray for the defamation of his royal benefactress, it is proper that readers familiar with the widely circulated libels written by him in the days of her adversity, should be aware of the flattering terms in which he sang her praises during the palmy season of her greatness, when her beauty was even less the theme of general admiration than the virtues and princely qualities which he thus eloquently extols—

[1] David Buchanan. Note to M'Crie's Life of Knox.

"Nymph of the Caledonian realm! who now
Dost happily the regal sceptre bear,
From kings innumerable handed down
To thee, whose peerless merit soars above
Thine high estate; whose virtues far exceed
Thy youthful years, as doth thy mind thy sex,
And matchless manners, thine illustrious birth—
Receive benignantly the verse divine
Of Israel's prophet king and bard, arrayed
In Latin garb, though not by poet born
Near Cyrrha or Parnassus' classic stream,
But 'neath the frigid pole-star's northern ray.
Nor had I ventured rashly to expose
Mine ill-born offspring, lest what pleaseth thee
(Perchance through partial favour kindly viewed),
Should me, too conscious of its faults, displease;
But what it could not from my genius hope,
It to thine all-indulgent grace may owe."

Mary, who, whatever might be the errors of her creed, possessed the delicacy and courtesy of a true Christian, was ever careful to avoid giving any cause of offence, by inconsiderate words or actions calculated to annoy her Protestant subjects; but, on the contrary, endeavoured to conciliate persons of different opinions to her own as far as she could, without conceding points of conscience to motives of policy.

One day, as she was passing to mass, she met her Protestant caterer Bisset, who was carrying his baby to be baptised in his parish kirk. Bisset took the liberty of stopping her Majesty, and entreating her to honour his bairn by giving him his name. Mary graciously condescended to his request, and in the way she knew would be most agreeable, by opening her Bible and choosing the first name she saw there, which proved to be Habakkuk—a name fortunately much approved by the Calvinists of the sixteenth century.[1]

As soon as the news of Tamworth's arrest transpired, Randolph demanded an audience of the Queen for the purpose of offering a remonstrance. Mary replied, "that she could not see him, being somewhat evil at ease," and referred him to her Council. The reason she excused herself

[1] Habakkuk Bisset became an author: there is preserved in the Advocates' Library a MS. of his, called the Rolment of Court, on the first leaf of which this anecdote of his baptism is recorded.—Life of James VI., by Robert Chambers.

was the embarrassment of her position in regard to her husband, whom etiquette required to be present at the reception of foreign ambassadors, in right of the regal title she had rashly conferred upon him, and whose regality Randolph meant publicly to disallow—an affront to which Queen Mary could not permit her consort to be exposed. Neither was the fiery and arrogant temper of Darnley to be trusted in collision with the inimical ambassador under the present circumstances. Randolph, being bent on forcing a quarrel which might serve as a pretext to his royal mistress for declaring war on Mary, and thus flinging the sword of England into the scale of the rebel Lords, professed himself dissatisfied with the answers of Mary's Council, and reiterated his demand of an audience with herself.[1] Mary knew her refusal to see him would be construed into an indication of hostility, and with delicate tact escaped the dilemma in which he was striving to place her, by appointing the following day, at an hour when her husband was engaged to visit Inchkeith to take order for its defence, and thus avoided any compromise of their mutual dignity. Instead of waiting to be attacked on the score of Tamworth's arrest, she commenced the conference by complaining of his misconduct, observing, "that he did not understand his duty, and that, being a stranger, he ought to have accommodated himself to the laws and customs of the country." Randolph boldly replied, "that Tamworth had violated none of them," although he had himself been not only witness of his misconduct in regard to sending the gold to Lady Moray, but a party to the deed. "If your Grace mean," continued the treacherous ambassador, "in that he refused the safe-conduct subscribed with the Lord Darnley's hand, I think it was his part so to do, for that had been no less than to have acknowledged him a king; whereas Mr Tamworth, being the Queen my mistress's ambassador, looked that both the father and son should have come and done their duty unto him." "It had been too much for either of them," observed Mary quietly.[2] "Much greater fault for Mr Tamworth otherwise to take them

[1] Randolph to Cecil, Aug. 27, 1565—State Paper MS. [2] Ibid.

than they have shown themselves," rejoined Randolph. "*He* is now a king," said Mary, in allusion to her husband, to mark that he was of higher rank than his father, with whom Randolph pertinaciously classed him. "To your Grace, and to as many as will take him, he may be so," replied Randolph; "but to us he is not, nor to any that are true subjects to my Sovereign."

Mary, significantly alluding to Darnley's nearness to the English Crown, observed, "I know what right he hath, and, next unto myself, I am assured the best;—I mean," added she, "after my good sister." Randolph dryly rejoined, "that he had never inquired much into the question of their rights, but was well assured that, if rights they had, they took the readiest way to be put beside them." "Yea," replied Mary, "I know that ye are about to establish the Crown to another."[1] Her allusion was to Lady Katharine Gray, in vindication of whose rival title the book written by Hales, Clerk of the Hanaper, had made a great sensation. Moreover, Cecil and Elizabeth's Council, as soon as Mary's engagement to Darnley was declared, had earnestly recommended their Sovereign to show some favour to that unfortunate lady, then languishing in prison.[2] It was the claims of the princesses of the Suffolk line on the succession, entailed to them by the will of the capricious and unconstitutional despot Henry VIII., that excited the jealousy of Mary Stuart, and induced her to place the undue importance she did on obtaining from Elizabeth the recognition of her legitimate and superior right to the heritage of the Crown.

Mary's importunity on this score was equally foolish and undignified; it lowered her own importance, even in the sight of her own partisans, by making that a matter of favour which ought to have been regarded as an immutable and inalienable right. But Mary was scarcely sane in her ideas of the power of sovereigns to bequeath their realms according to their caprices. On every other subject her mind was in advance of the times in which she lived, but

[1] Randolph to Cecil, August 27, 1565—State Paper Office MS., inedited.
[2] Cecil's Journal.

this fallacious notion was five hundred years behind the march of reason and the progress of civil liberty. In the course of her conversation with Randolph, she imprudently added, "I trust I shall find otherwise in my good sister than so; or, if not, I trust I shall not want some friends that will be loth to see me lose my right: and I assure you I have received letters, which came through your hands, from the King my good brother of France, that he will take my part in any wrong that shall be offered me; and some other friends I trust I shall find, that will help me if I stand in need."[1] Randolph asked "if any of these could stand her more in stead than the Queen his mistress?" "I have sought her friendship as much as I can," returned Mary, "and have offered as much as reason requireth." Randolph told her "her offers were fair enough, but the conditions she attached to them were too hard to be allowed, and more contained in them than she ever demanded with Leicester." "So have I reason," said Mary; "for this man, my husband, hath a right, and so hath not my Lord of Leicester: and to provide for him, his mother, and brother, it is my part; and without that will I never accord to any agreement." After this burst of royal spirit she promised to release Tamworth; then, turning to Randolph, sternly added, "And for yourself, I have to say unto you, that I know you have intelligence with my rebels, and in special with my Lord of Moray. You do not your part therein, and I advise you to leave it."

Mary spoke with great bitterness of the Earl of Moray in the course of this conference, and declared "she would rather lose her crown than not chastise him for his misconduct." The royal Rose of Scotland had hitherto dispensed nothing but sweetness, but was now minded to show that she could use her thorns if touched too rudely. Randolph, of course, became more spiteful and detracting in all he said of her, after she had given him a personal cause of offence. He draws the following picture of the distracted state of the country: "Stealing, killing, and slaying in every part. This town hath now given two hun-

[1] Cecil's Journal.

dred pounds sterling, and none of them goeth with her, for that she knoweth how well they favour the other part. She hath borrowed money of divers, and yet hath not wherewith to pay so many soldiers as are levied for two months."[1]

Two hundred pounds, less than a thousand of present currency, was indeed a small sum for Mary and her bridegroom to take the field with; but in spite of all Randolph, Knox, and Buchanan—three very eloquent writers—assert to the contrary, the facts prove that she had the hearts of her people, that "cheap defence of Princes." She acted in this emergency with energy and spirit, indicative of the confidence inspired by her popularity, and showed herself no whit behind the most distinguished of her predecessors in courage and ability. Every day she sat in council with her husband and her ministers, and issued letters in both their names, appealing to the loyalty of the nobles and gentlemen of Scotland for assistance, addressing each by the endearing epithet of "trusty friend;" and requesting them "to come with their whole kin, friends, and household, to meet their Sovereigns, who were preparing, on the 25th of August, to go in person to pursue the rebels." These circulars bear the double signature of Marie R. and Henrie R., and afford ocular evidence that, in the first month of their marriage, her name, contrary to the general statement of historians, preceded his.[2]

Before she left Edinburgh, Mary took the bold step, conjointly with her husband, of sending an order to the Town Council and Corporation to depose their factious Provost, Archibald Douglas of Kilspindie, and elect in his place Simon Preston of Craigmillar—an act of illegal authority which the exigencies of the crisis rendered necessary, if not excusable. So true it is that despotism is the offspring of faction.[3]

Alexander Seton, a contemporary poet of gentle birth, addressed, probably about this period, some elegant Latin verses to Mary, intimating that Lesley, Bishop of Ross (in

[1] Cecil's Journal. [2] Keith, 313.
[3] Knox; Keith; Tytler; Chalmers.

a copy of whose History of Scotland they were written), should hereafter record the events of Mary's life and reign, as he had done those of her illustrious ancestors; but, in the mean time, his less distinguished muse ventures to render a humble tribute to her worth. The following lines, translated from the original Latin, may serve as a specimen:—

"Divided from the world by ocean's roar,
In this free isle thy fathers dwelt of yore;
But ours the blessings of thy reign to share,
And bloodless triumphs o'er thy foes declare,
The love of peace thy gentle thoughts retain,
Justice, and truth, and faith devoid of stain.
Thy noble deeds let worthy Lesley show—
Whose wisdom counselled what 'twas thine to do—
While I in humbler phrase presume to name
Thy matchless virtues, lest the world should blame,
If one, whose sires to thine were ever leal,
Should prove degenerate to thee in zeal."

MARY STUART

CHAPTER XIX.

SUMMARY

Queen Mary takes the field in person against the rebel Lords—Her martial array—She writes to Queen Elizabeth from Stirling—The rebels retreat before her army—Her spirited demeanour—Events of her campaign—Her rebels privately encouraged and succoured by England—Queen Mary returns in triumph to Edinburgh with her consort—Elizabeth intercedes for Moray and his confederates—Mary begs her not to interfere—Mary pardons and restores Bothwell—Makes him her Lieutenant—Darnley disputes the appointment; wishes his father to have the military command—Discord between the Queen and him—French ambassador sent to congratulate Mary and Darnley on their marriage—Discussions between Mary and him—She refuses to treat with the rebel Lords—Fines their seditious confederates—Pledges her jewels for money to pay her troops—Remonstrates with Elizabeth for encouraging the rebel Lords—Mary's second campaign—She drives Moray and his confederates out of the realm—Enters Dumfries—Clement use of her successes—Moray's calumnies against her disseminated by Randolph—Incendiary proceedings of Randolph—Conjugal vexations of Mary—Her consort's neglect and frequent absences.

QUEEN MARY'S frank appeal to the loyalty of the gentlemen of Scotland had been responded to so well, that a muster of five thousand able-bodied troops, in warlike array, with fifteen days' provisions, followed her banner when she left Edinburgh, on the 26th of August, to take the field in person against the insurgent Lords. The advanced guard was led by the Earl of Morton, Lord Chancellor of Scotland; the Earl of Lennox commanded the van. In the centre of the host rode the Queen, her consort, her ladies, the Lords of her Council, and David Riccio. In token of her determination, if necessary, to set the fortunes of Scot-

land on a field, and share the dangers of the conflict with her men-at-arms, the royal bride rode with pistols at her saddle-bow. It was reported, withal, that her scarlet and gold embroidered riding-dress covered a light suit of defensive armour, and that under her regal hood and veil she wore a steel casque. Her bridegroom indulged in the boyish foppery of donning gilded armour for this occasion, he alone of all her company being thus adorned—a dangerous distinction, for, in pursuance of their predeterminate purpose against his life, the associate Lords, under the command of his kind cousin of Moray, had appointed divers military assassins, in the rebel host, "in the event of a battle, to set upon the Queen's husband; and these were pledged either to kill him or die themselves."[1]

The patriotic intentions of the insurgents are further signified by Randolph to Cecil in these words: "They expect relief of more money from England, much promised and little received yet. If her Majesty Queen Elizabeth will now help them, they doubt not but one country shall receive both Queens."[2] Well had it been for Mary if the dark doom of a tragic widowhood, and life-long incarceration in an English prison and the block, had been accomplished in the manner her traitor brother and his confederates then proposed, by the slaughter of her husband and the deliverance of herself into the hands of their patroness, Queen Elizabeth. Her honour as a woman would not in that case have suffered, for those who finally succeeded in crushing her under the weight of their own crimes, must have stood forth to the world in the unscreened blackness of their guilt. The niggardliness of the English Sovereign prevented them from consummating their treasons by force of arms, and reduced them to the necessity of working out their objects by subtler and more effectual means. Such was the preponderance of public opinion in Mary's favour at the time of this insurrectionary movement of Moray and his faction, that the rebel army never exceeded twelve hundred men, which number dimi-

[1] Randolph to Cecil, Sept. 3—State Paper MS. Caligula, b. 10, folio 335—Cotton Library, British Museum. Goodall.

[2] Ibid.

nished every day, while hers increased.[1] The same day she left Edinburgh the Queen reached Linlithgow. The men of that royal burgh came to meet her at the Water of Avon, and conducted her to her palace, where she and her consort slept that night, and the next at Stirling.

During her brief sojourn at Stirling, August 28, Mary wrote a short letter to Queen Elizabeth to ask safe-conduct and despatch for a gentleman whom she was sending with letters to Charles IX. Her principal object in doing this appears to be, to show Elizabeth that she was personally engaged in the suppression of a rebellion, fomented, if not excited, by her agents, and that she had no cause for dejection; and also for the sake of mentioning her husband by his regal title:—

"MADAM MY GOOD SISTER,—Having had news from the King my brother-in-law, I despatch this gentleman of mine expressly to make a report to him of the state of my affairs in this country, and would not do this without sending you a line to recommend myself to your good graces, and to pray you to let him be expedited, that his letters may not be old. And because I have no leisure, being on my march with the King my husband against our rebels, I cannot write you a longer letter, than to pray God to give you, Madam, my good sister, health, and a very long and happy life.

"From Stirling, this 28 of August.

"Your very affectionate good sister and cousin, and faithful friend,

"MARIE R."[2]

Nearly a week previous to this date, Elizabeth boasted to the French ambassador, de Foix, "that she had intercepted and read letters written by the Queen of Scotland's husband to the King of France, written in a very flattering strain, and informing his most Christian Majesty 'that he intended to cross over to France in a few days, to pay his respects to him in person, in order to declare to him by word of mouth his devotion to his Majesty's service, and his hopes of receiving the like aid and support his predecessors had always done from France.'"[3] Elizabeth complained, at the same time, "that the King of France had

[1] Keith; Chalmers; Knox; Randolph.
[2] State Paper Office MS., London—Autograph.
[3] Teulet, vol. ii. p. 65.

preferred the Lord d'Aubigné, Lennox's brother, to the honour of commanding his Scotch Guard, which she took much amiss, being a token of his favourable disposition towards that family." It is to be remembered that Elizabeth was at that time engaged in an absurd matrimonial negotiation with the boy-King of France, which gave her a sort of right to administer political lectures to his representative, on Scottish affairs.[1]

Mary passed on to Glasgow on the 29th, thinking to have met the rebels there; but these, warned of their Queen's approach and formidable array, halted at Paisley, then a secluded village.[2]

It is probable, as Glasgow was in a pestilent state of disaffection, that their Majesties spent that night at Cruickstone Castle, the family mansion of the house of Lennox. Local tradition and local poetry connect the names of the ill-fated cousins with this picturesque feudal ruin; and it is devoutly believed, not only in that immediate vicinity, but all over Scotland, that they first spoke of love and marriage under the ominous shadow of the giant yew-tree which then grew beneath its walls. Sir Walter Scott availed himself of the licence of a writer of fiction to introduce this tradition into his romance of *The Abbot* with thrilling effect; but, like several other passages in that work which have since been advanced as arguments against Mary's innocence, his inferences were erroneous, and, indeed, opposed to facts.

The events of every day, from the first meeting between Queen Mary and Darnley in Wemyss Castle till they arrived in Glasgow, with their army, in quest of the rebel host, have been so clearly defined,[3] that it is perfectly evident they could not have visited Cruickstone Castle before the 29th of August, just one month from the date of their public marriage in Holyrood Chapel.

The Earl of Argyll and the Duke of Châtelherault had promised to meet Moray, with their powers, the next day at

[1] Teulet, vol. ii. p. 65. [2] Keith. Knox.
[3] See Randolph's letters, and the dates of Mary's public acts in Edinburgh, Stirling, and Perth.

Hamilton, but, being panic-stricken at the bold demeanour and rapid march of the Queen, failed him. Moray and his army, in taking the high-road from Paisley towards Hamilton, passed so near Glasgow as almost to come in sight of the Queen and her loyal muster. Their Majesties were up betimes on the morrow, August 31, and commenced their march from Glasgow in pursuit of the rebels long before sunrise, but encountered so terrible a storm of wind and rain that a little brook presently became a great river. The men-at-arms waxed weary with the raging storm of wind and rain beating full in their faces, and could with difficulty proceed; but the Queen's courage increased manlike, so that she was ever with the foremost.[1] Many persons were swept away by the floods that dreadful day;[2] among the rest, one of the King's preceptors, Arthur Lallard, was drowned in essaying to pass the swollen waters of the Carron.[3] The Queen kept the saddle many hours, notwithstanding the fury of the storm and the badness of the roads; and, with her husband, arrived at Callander House well wetted. Her rebels entered Edinburgh the next day, but not in triumph. They facetiously observed, indeed, "that they had come to meet the Parliament,"[4] which Mary had, previously to her marriage, prorogued to the 1st of September, and perhaps, in the hurry and excitement of her march, omitted to re-prorogue to a later date. "They got no good of their coming, though they despatched messengers northward and southward praying for succour, but all in vain."[5] The country people wished not to change their winsome liege lady for her base-born brother, or to pass under the degrading yoke of the English Sovereign. In Edinburgh the rebel Lords "caused to strike their drum, desiring all such men as would receive wages for the defence of the glory of God to resort the following day to the church, where they should receive good pay;"[6] but not even the eloquence of their

[1] Knox, Hist. Ref. Scot.
[2] Randolph to Cecil—State Paper MS., inedited.
[3] Knox. See the Life of Lady Margaret, Countess of Lennox, vol. ii. of this series, for curious particulars of Arthur Lallard.
[4] Knox. [5] Ibid. [6] Ibid.

favourite ministers could infuse a bellicose spirit into the citizens on that occasion. Neither comfort nor support in the good town of Edinburgh was to be obtained for rebellion, since the factious Provost, Archibald Douglas of Kilspindie, had been deposed by Mary's order. The next day Alexander Erskine fired on them from the Castle battery, and they decamped quicker than they came. If they had tarried another day they would have got a royal salute from the Queen and her harquebussiers, for, hearing of their march to Edinburgh, Mary was rapidly advancing from Stirling to attack them; but they fled to Hamilton. Randolph condoles with Cecil on the sorrowful fact that their friends were forced to leave that town. "The Queen minded to have taken them here," he continues, "and but that the Saturday was so *fowle* a day, she had gone near them; and yet she spared not to ride twenty miles that day. Hearing that they were departed, she returneth to Stirling, and from thence to Glasgow, where she is this Tuesday night. Her ladies all and gentlewomen are clean left behind her, saving one somewhat stronger than the others. I take it but for a tale that she doth herself bear sometimes a pistolet, and had that time one in her hand, when, coming near Hamilton, she looked to have fought."[1]

Randolph concludes his animated report of Mary's Amazonian bearing with this remark: "And in the whole world if there be a more malicious *harte* towards the Queen my Sovereign than is she that now here reigneth, let me be hanged at my home-coming, or counted a villain for ever." An evident consciousness of his own deservings gives a sarcastic point to this imprecatory asseveration, which must have extorted a smile even from the sage English Secretary and all his partners in iniquity at Elizabeth's council-board; for never surely did violator of the sacred character of an ambassador, and confidential abettor of assassins and traitors, deserve a rope more richly than Master Thomas Randolph. But Mary Stuart was not so lavish of halters as her royal sister of England, and it must

[1] State Paper Office MS., inedited—Scotch Correspondence.

be recorded to her honour that only two men were hanged in the course of this rebellion. That even these suffered rests on the unsubstantiated assertion of Knox, who does not mention their names, but, as he says, "these poor men were convicted of taking the Lords' wages, by the soldiers;" they might possibly have been sentenced by martial law as spies.[1]

The Queen retraced her steps towards Glasgow, expecting to have found the insurgent Lords there; but they had retreated precipitately to Lanark, and from thence to Dumfries. Instead of following them thither, the royal pair remained at Glasgow, or perhaps at Cruickstone Castle, for nearly a week, and then returned to Stirling. Two companies of infantry from Edinburgh met them there, and attended them into Fifeshire. On her way Mary summoned Castle Campbell, her rebel brother-in-law Argyll's strong fortress, which was surrendered to her. The whole of the loyal nobles and gentlemen of Fife came to meet and escort their liege lady to St Andrews. She expelled from their castles those who had aided the rebel cause or trafficked with England, and compelled all whose principles were doubtful to subscribe a bond pledging themselves to defend her and her consort against Englishmen and rebels; nor did she forget to inflict fines on the disaffected corporations of St Andrews and Dundee.[2]

Queen Mary's courage, energy, and unwearied personal activity astonished her followers, and appeared to render greater things possible to her than the suppression of an insurrection of which the leaders dared not once face her. When some of the nobles of her own party, considering her too careless of her health and personal safety, entreated her "not to ride in bad weather, nor to remain so many hours in the saddle," she gaily answered, "I shall not rest from my toils till I have led you all to London."[3]

So heroic was the demeanour, so successful the enterprises of the young northern Queen, at this period, and such was the enthusiastic admiration excited by her manners

[1] History of the Reformation in Scotland.
[2] Ibid. Keith. Randolph's Letters. Cecil's Journal of Abstracts.
[3] Paul de Foix to Catherine de Medicis—Pièces et Documens, &c.

and appearance, that even in the headquarters of disaffection she had no occasion to fire a single volley. Her presence was sufficient to disarm revolt; the fines she inflicted were paid without a murmur. Her party in England was now very strong, especially in Yorkshire, where unequivocal symptoms of disloyalty to Queen Elizabeth's government appeared. From Ireland Mary received assurances that, if she could send an effectual force to support her partisans there, she might annex that island to her native realm. Elizabeth, perceiving she had been too hasty in crediting the assertions of Randolph, that Mary was held in universal contempt, abated from her haughty tone of dictation, made deceitful professions of her sisterly friendship for Mary, and proffered her good offices to adjust the differences between the rebel Lords and their Sovereign.[1] Mary replied with great spirit, "that if it should please the Queen of England to send any person, properly accredited to effect a reconciliation between themselves, by explaining and composing the various causes of displeasure that had unfortunately arisen, he should be heartily welcome, as it was her greatest wish to establish and preserve relations of perfect amity with the Queen of England; but if it were only for a pretence of interfering in the affairs of her realm, with regard to the matters between her and her subjects, she wished to have it plainly understood that she would not endure such interference, either from the Queen of England or any other monarch;" adding, "that she was perfectly able herself to chastise her rebels, and bring them to reason."[2] Elizabeth expressed herself very angrily to de Foix, the French ambassador, on the subject of this rejection of her friendly and neighbourly offices. That statesman, endeavouring to take the difficult part of a mediator between the angry Queens, was requested by Elizabeth to hear from Cecil a statement of the causes of complaint made by her clients, the Scotch rebel Lords, against their Sovereign. Cecil professed the impossibility of deciding who was the most to blame in this rupture, but added "that he had been told that it all

[1] Keith; Chalmers; Camden.
[2] Conversation between Elizabeth and de Foix—Teulet, vol. ii. p. 70.

proceeded from the marriage of the Queen of Scotland with the son of the Earl of Lennox, previously to which she and her subjects had lived in the greatest harmony, owing to the good administration and faithful services of those whom she at present pursued;"[1]—thus depriving Mary of the credit due to her for the temperate and maternal tenor of her rule, and the successful manner in which she had exerted herself to conciliate the affections of all parties in the difficult position she had occupied for the last four years, as Sovereign of a realm exhausted with eighteen years of invasion, and convulsed with internal strife. Cecil's object was to infer that all the good which Mary's able personal exertions had effected in her realm was to be attributed to the ability and wisdom of her Prime Minister, the Earl of Moray, now leader of the rebels. Yet he well knew, that, independently of the fact that Moray was Elizabeth's spy and pensioner, his selfish rapacity with regard to the estates of the Earl of Huntley had plunged Scotland into a civil war; and that his robbing the orphan heiress of Buchan of her patrimony, under pretext of a matrimonial engagement with her which he never fulfilled, were abuses of power that ought to have subjected any minister to disgrace and punishment. Cecil, however, implies that this righteous Daniel had governed with singleness of heart and cleanness of hands, which ought to have induced his royal mistress to refrain from marriage, in order to keep him at the head of affairs. If Mary had done this, and left him in possession of the executive power of the Crown, she might probably have continued to hold the name and revenues of a Queen of Scotland, untouched by calumny, and led a life of pleasure unmolested.

"The rebel Lords demanded," Cecil said, "that the Queen should replace them in the same state of peace and repose they had enjoyed previous to her marriage, and that she should remove all causes of complaint which had been given, by innovations against their laws, liberties, and the privileges of the nobles. When de Foix inquired "what inno-

[1] De Foix's Report of Conference between himself, Cecil, and other Lords of Elizabeth's Council, in Teulet, vol. ii. p. 72.

vations had been made by the Queen of Scots?" Cecil, as the organ of the insurgent Peers, replied that, "according to the laws of the realm, the Duke of Châtelherault and the Earl of Argyll were hereditary councillors of the Crown of Scotland, and that they had been driven away. Moreover, that the husband of the Queen of Scotland, against the laws of the realm, and to the prejudice of the nearest in blood, had been proclaimed King. Yet her first husband King Francis, being Dauphin of France, never assumed the title of King of Scotland till it had been conferred upon him by the general consent of the Estates of that realm—a Prince very great in comparison of the son of the Earl of Lennox, who was of no account." The gravest matter of accusation against Darnley was, "that he had wished to slay the Earl of Moray, and treated him at all times with threats and various kinds of insults."[1] Among other causes of complaints objected against Queen Mary by Moray and the malcontents, was the great consideration with which she treated her two Italian servants, David Riccio, and Francisco, her maître-d'hôtel.

So great was Mary's indignation at the proceedings of the rebel Lords, and the false accusations they continued to promulgate against both her husband and herself, that she refused to listen to any intercession in their behalf; much less would she enter into any treaty with them. "She is now so offended," observes Randolph, "that she cannot abide any man that wisheth concord between her and them. To endure and to bear at her hands they think their duty,"—a sentiment assuredly much opposed by their conduct at this time; but, according to the representation of their friend Randolph, they were not in arms against her, but against her husband, the object of their deadly hostility. These are their words: "But to live under him, that in all these things, that in her are grievous, but in him outrageous, they think intolerable, and had rather try any fortune, and so are resolved; for other surety they can find none."[2] How, then, can Mary be reasonably blamed for refusing to

[1] De Foix's Report of Conference between himself, Cecil, and other Lords of Elizabeth's Council, in Teulet, vol. ii. p. 72.

[2] Randolph to Cecil, Sept. 22, 1565—State Paper Office MS., inedited.

restore to her favour men who avowed such malignant feelings against her husband, and were determined to proceed to any lengths rather than pay him the respect due to his position as the consort of their Sovereign?

"As these noblemen," continues Randolph, "that are now pursued are the best friends the Queen my sovereign hath" (sufficient reason for Mary's displeasure and distrust of persons so forgetful of their duty as Scots), "so do I desire that this Queen may never have her whole will over them. As this man whom she hath chosen her husband, and made a King, showeth himself altogether unworthy of that which she hath called him unto, so do I wish that he never attain unto that which he so earnestly looketh for, and in a manner maketh his most assured account."[1] With all this combination of ill-will from the most subtle and unscrupulous statesmen of the age against a youth in his teens, he would have had small chance of escaping the snares that were set for him on every side, even if he had been a person of sounder judgment and better conduct than the rash, self-sufficient Darnley.

Queen Elizabeth assured the French ambassador that she had not given the slightest encouragement to the Scotch insurgent Lords; and when he told her that he understood she had sent them some money, she denied it with an oath.[2] Yet she had written to the Earl of Bedford, as the surviving document proves, to let Moray have a thousand pounds, and more if he saw his need to be great, and further sums if required. Bedford was also to send three hundred English harquebussiers to his aid; "and to cover that matter the better," observes she, "you shall send these numbers to Carlisle, as to be laid there in garrison to defend that march, now in this time that such powers are on the other part drawing to these frontiers, or any of them may most covertly repair to the said Lords," &c.[3] There is, moreover, in the State Paper Office, the petition of J. Nicolson and J. Johnson to Queen Elizabeth, complaining "that

[1] Randolph to Cecil, Sept. 22, 1565—State Paper Office MS., inedited.
[2] De Foix's Ambassadorial Reports, in Teulet's Pièces et Documens relatifs des Affaires d'Escosses, vol. ii.
[3] Printed in Robertson's Appendix.

they have been put to the last extremity by their Sovereign, the Queen of Scots, in consequence of their having conveyed an aid of money to the Earl of Moray from Mr Tamworth."[1] So much for the queenly honour of Elizabeth, and the regard she paid to her oaths. But Mary's attitude was now so formidable that Elizabeth felt the necessity of denying the causes of offence she had given her.

The meddling of the inexperienced Darnley in political affairs at this period is evidenced by a letter from one of Queen Elizabeth's secret-service men, informing her of the arrival of Yaxley, an Englishman, who was trusted and employed by Mary, through the influence of Lennox and his son, in her private correspondence with the King of Spain. "At Yaxley's coming," observes our authority, "our young King was much rejoiced. The said Yaxley, wishing to make himself esteemed as a worthy councillor, began to talk of England, of France, Spain, Rome, Italy — in which, though he used much cunning, he was easily penetrated by all present. But to our King and his young company he seemed an able man, proper to be sent abroad on state affairs. He has been, in consequence, despatched to the Duchess of Arschot very secretly, and is by her means to have access to the Lady-Regent of the Low Countries, to show her that the Queen of Scots, having reason to doubt the credit of her uncles with the Court of France, had been advised to address herself to the King of Spain; and if he would be pleased to take that charge upon him, she would commit herself, her husband, and her realm, into his protection. And as she understood the Queen of England was going to marry the King of France, she must rely on the King of Spain for support, and was willing to act by his counsel and guidance."[2]

Yaxley was also intrusted with an autograph letter from Queen Mary to Philip, in which she accredits him as an English gentleman, a Catholic, and the faithful servant of the King her husband and herself. In this letter Mary protests her own and her husband's devoted attachment to

[1] De Foix to the Queen-mother of France, September 16, 1565. In Teulet, vol. ii. p. 74.

[2] Teulet, p. 54.

their religion; and states her conviction, that it is the intention of her Protestant subjects to deprive them of their crown, unless they obtained the support of one of the great Princes of Christendom. "The struggle," she says, "is not only for the Crown, but for the liberty of the Church, which otherwise will be crushed for ever."[1] Philip placed twenty thousand crowns in the hands of his ambassador in London, to be applied in the aid of his royal suppliant, whose instances were probably seconded by his consort, her sister-in-law and early friend, Elizabeth of France—aid dearly purchased by the ill-will such correspondence excited when exposed to her Protestant subjects. Much mistaken was Mary in supposing that a general feeling of disaffection to her person and government pervaded these; as, indeed, the ardour with which the majority of them supported her in the struggle against Moray ought to have convinced her.[2] Nor can any sovereign commit a greater error than seeking the support of a foreign prince. The Pope, whom she also had solicited for money to assist her in her pecuniary destitution, sent her eight thousand crowns; but the ship was wrecked on the coast of Bamborough, and the money seized by the Earl of Northumberland, who, though a partisan of Mary, and a Roman Catholic, could not resist the temptation of seizing the gold, and positively refused to relinquish his prey. He vindicated his privileges as master-wrecker on that coast, by making his lawyer read to Sir James Melville, whom Mary sent to claim the money, an old Norman charter, of which neither he nor Melville understood a word.[3]

Meantime the insurgent Lords, finding themselves disappointed in their expectation of being joined by a general rising of the Protestants, thought proper to write letters to Queen Mary, offering "to return to their allegiance, provided she would restore to them their forfeit estates, replace them in the places and preferments they formerly enjoyed, and permit them to choose her Council, that she should remove all foreigners from her service, and refrain from the use of the

[1] Labanoff, vol. i. [2] Tytler; Chalmers; Keith.
[3] Memoirs of Sir James Melville.

mass." As Mary treated these demands with contempt, they proceeded to publish seditious letters, declaring that "their motives in taking up arms were for the security of their religion, the glory of God, and to prevent infractions on the laws and liberties of the realm by two or three foreigners, who had the sole guidance of the Queen." The fallacious nature of these pretexts, and the selfish motives of the parties who were thus endeavouring to plunge the realm into the woes of civil war, were exposed by the Queen in a masterly proclamation, which she put forth in her own and her husband's names while at St Andrews, reminding her subjects of the liberty of conscience and security of property they had enjoyed under her personal reign.[1] The great body of her people were too sensible of the reality of these blessings to desire to exchange the gentle sway of their liege lady for the yoke of the selfish oligarchy then striving to obtain the mastery over their rightful Sovereign by means of English gold.

Mary, after a brief visit to Perth and Dunfermline, returned to Edinburgh in triumph with her consort, and caused the above proclamation to be made with sound of trumpet at the Mercat Cross on the morrow.[2] On that day, September 20th, and not before, James Earl of Bothwell, who had returned from his long exile on the 17th of that month, got presence of their Majesties at Holyrood, and was graciously received by both.[3] This was the first time Mary and Bothwell had met since his memorable examination before her and her council at St Andrews, April 1562, when she had ordered him to be warded in Edinburgh Castle, to stand his trial for the treasonable offence of having conspired, in concert with the Hamiltons, to seize her person, carry her off from Falkland to Dumbarton, and put Moray and Lethington to death. The decided madness of his accuser, the Earl of Arran, the disloyal proceedings of the Hamiltons, and above all, the serpentine conduct of the Earl of Moray, who had been so eager to push the charge against Bothwell, naturally pro-

[1] Knox. Lyon's History of St Andrews
[2] Knox, Hist. Ref. Scot. [3] Diurnal of Occurrents.

duced a reaction of feeling in his favour in the royal mind. He, though a Protestant, had done her mother good and loyal service in time of need,[1] and had refused to enrich himself with English bribes when deprived of all his living in Scotland—covetousness not being his besetting sin. Regarding him now as one of the victims of the Moray administration, Mary might naturally reproach herself with childish folly in having been induced to attach the slightest importance to the tales of the lunatic Arran. Could she remember without horror the manner in which she had been rendered by Moray a facile instrument in bringing the unfortunate Sir John Gordon to the block, on a similar accusation? The nobler her disposition was, the greater her desire of making amends to any person whom she had reason to think she had treated unjustly. Bothwell, however, being conscious of his own guilt, scarcely gave Mary credit for supposing it possible for him to be innocent of the audacious design he had cherished, and finally drew presumptuous inferences from the confidence with which she treated him on his return. Motives of political expediency had rendered his recall necessary, in order to strengthen the Crown against the insurgent Lords in the pay of the English Sovereign. Nor would it have been possible for Queen Mary to carry on the government without forming a new Cabinet, after the defection of Moray and his coadjutors in office, of which the elements would naturally be their opponents, on the same principles as a change of ministry in modern times from Tories to Whigs.

The Borderers, over whom Bothwell held hereditary dominion, were in a state of dangerous insubordination in consequence of his exile, and committing all sorts of outrages on their fellow-subjects, in which they were encouraged by the English authorities. Here is an instance of their doings in the absence of their feudal chief, affording sufficient reason for his recall: "The Brodies," writes Bedford, "have done great things of late, as the burning of a town called Hawick, and therefore are to be considered. Preparation is made to ride upon them by

[1] See vol. ii., Lives of Queens of Scotland.

that realm; and had they not so stirred as they did, on their own neighbours and countrymen, our marches had long before this time smarted therefor; and if they be ridden upon, and be not holpen, they cannot hold out, but must needs give over, and shall have their pardons, as it is thought, offered them; and if the Earl of Bothwell come, who is their Lord, then will they go with him, if there be none other way taken before."[1] It was imperatively necessary, under these circumstances, to send a strong military force to the Border, both to repress such outrages as the above, and to prevent an inbreak from the English side. No man appeared to the Queen and her Council so suitable for this service as Bothwell, who knew the country, the people, and the peculiar nature of the warfare carried on in those districts. Moreover, the petty chiefs, his vassals, who were at present in a state of brigandism for want of their hereditary leader, would all be ready to obey his behests and follow his banner.[2] Darnley opposed the appointment, and signified his pleasure that his father, the Earl of Lennox, should be made Lieutenant of the Border. However dear to Queen Mary the husband was for whose sake she had involved herself in a war with her nobles, she could not allow her regal authority and experience in the government of the realm to be overborne by a petulant youth of his age. She carried her point, but not without a contest, which acquired undesirable publicity, and is thus reported to Cecil by Randolph: "This also shall not be unknown unto you, what jars there are already risen between her and her husband: she to have her will one way, and he another; he to have his father Lieutenant-general, and she to have the Earl of Bothwell; he to have this man preferred, and she another."[3] Captain Cockburn, one of Cecil's agents, who had been sent with letters to Mary

[1] Bedford to Cecil, August 18, 1565. Stevenson's Illustrations of the Reign of Queen Mary, p. 128.

[2] Bothwell was, in fact, possessed of similar power and influence on the marches of Scotland as the Mortimers were on those of England and Wales—holding, as it were, the keys of the realm at his disposal.

[3] State Paper MS., inedited.

from the French ambassador de Foix, recommending an accommodation between her and the rebel Lords, mentions this dispute in terms far more invidious: "The King and she have been at great debate and strife for the choosing of a Lieutenant. The King would have his father and she would have the Earl of Bothwell to be Lieutenant, by reason he bears evil will against the Earl of Moray, and has promised to have him, dead or alive; and for that case she makes him her Lieutenant, and not the Earl of Lennox."[1] As this appointment was settled only two or three days after Bothwell's return, it was impossible for either Cockburn or Randolph, unfriendly as they were to Queen Mary, to place a scandalous construction on her giving the command of the troops to him, in preference to her father-in-law. Cockburn is therefore reduced to the necessity of imputing it to her desire of vengeance against the Earl of Moray, as if Lennox would have been more likely to spare the ambitious rival of the legitimate line of the royal Stuarts, who had conspired, not only against his son's life, but his own, and had denied his son the title of King! In addition to the reasons already stated, for the appointment of Bothwell as the fittest person for the office, Mary had already seen enough of Lennox's mind to deter her from intrusting him with the command of a military force, which might haply be used for the furtherance of his own ends.

It is certain that Mary was ill at ease, either in mind or body, at that time. Captain Cockburn—who had his audience of her on the 22d of September, and took the opportunity, for the purpose of serving his friends the insurgent Lords, to represent to her the troubles which originated from the dissensions between the King her father and the Douglas faction, and that there was every prospect of the quarrel between her and her rebels producing even more disastrous consequences—says "she wept wondrous sore, and said, 'I know you love the contrary part.' 'I do love them and the religion both,' replied Cockburn; 'and not the less am I of good mind to do your

[1] Captain Cockburn to Cecil, Oct. 2, 1565—State Paper MS., inedited.

Grace service, or else I had not taken so great travail and pains, and great expense, to come and see you.'"[1] Touched by this deceitful profession, Mary took his arm, and allowed him the honour of conducting her to her chamber, where he left her: she came not out for two days, till the French ambassador, M. Mauvissière de Castelnau, arrived in Edinburgh; "and if I said much," observes Cockburn, "he said more, and made her to weep again. She and her Council allege Mauvissière and I are retained by England, and all because we show her the truth." That Mary was startled at the tone assumed by Mauvissière on this mission, and the manner in which he echoed all Queen Elizabeth's observations on the impropriety of her desiring to chastise her factious and rebellious nobles, ought not to excite surprise; but it is amusing to find Cockburn, while engaged in writing to the English Secretary malign reports of his native Sovereign's conduct, carrying hypocrisy so far as to complain even to him of her accusing him of being in the interest of England, as if he expected to deceive his very employer.

The King and Queen-mother of France, having appointed M. Mauvissière de Castelnau to carry their congratulations to Queen Mary and Darnley on their marriage, proposed to Mary that he should endeavour to mediate an accommodation between her and the Queen of England. Mary joyfully accepted this offer; but Mauvissière, in passing through London, was induced by Elizabeth and de Foix, the French ambassador there, to include the rebel Lords in this pacific negotiation, and for that purpose obtained letters from the King of France, addressed to them. This step was taken without consulting Mary, who was much annoyed at the idea of treating with her own subjects through the intervention of a foreign power, or indeed treating with them at all, as she was in a position to dictate to them, and would accept nothing from them but unconditional submission.[2] She explained to the ambassador "that nothing had been done on her part to provoke the revolt; that she had made no alteration in the established religion;

[1] Captain Cockburn to Cecil, Oct. 2, 1565—State Paper MS., inedited.

[2] Despatches of Mauvissière de Castelnau and Paul de Foix to Charles IX., in Teulet's Pièces et Documens.

and in regard to her marriage, the insurgent Lords had agreed to it in the first instance, and then endeavoured to prevent it, wishing to be Kings themselves, instead of subjects. They were devoid of faith to their native Sovereign, having applied for aid to the Queen of England, and offered to become tributaries to her, instead of performing their leal duty to their Queen and country. Her spirit was too high," she said, "to allow subjects like these to give laws to her, and convert her realm, which from ancient time had been a monarchy, into a republic. She would prefer death to seeing it come to that." With tears in her eyes, she observed that "her whole reliance was on France, which would lose somewhat if she were crushed, seeing that the Kings of France had often had good service from the Scots. But if she were abandoned by her royal brother and mother-in-law, she should be compelled to seek aid from another Prince." Then she conjured the ambassador, "as he had been in her service, and received his nurture from the house of Guise, not to tell a living creature that he had been instructed to advise her to enter into treaty with her rebel Lords, because she could neither do it with honour, nor with personal safety to the King her husband and herself, whom, out of malice and ill-will, they had conspired to slay;" passionately adding, "I would rather lose an arm than they should receive those letters which the King of France has written to them; and I beg you will not let them know that you were empowered to negotiate between them and me, for as the King of France says 'you are sent to do the best for me in my need,' it would be far more desirable to let it be supposed you have come to promise his support to me."[1] The ambassador told her "it was impossible for the King of France to succour her in any way, for that would provoke a war with the Queen of England; but that the King of France and the Queen-mother earnestly advised her to concede some things, to induce her Lords to live in peace with her." "Let the King your master understand," she replied, "the impossibility of my making a good

[1] Despatches of Mauvissière de Castelnau and Paul de Foix to Charles IX., in Teulet's Pièces et Documens.

accord with men who have conspired to kill my husband." After a lengthened discussion, she carried her point that the letters which had been so officiously written to the insurgent Lords should not be delivered to them.[1]

The next morning Queen Mary appointed Mauvissière to meet her in the garden of Holyrood Palace, where he found her walking with her consort. Sir James Balfour, the secularised parson of Flisk (who was at that time acting as Secretary of State), being in attendance, discussed with the ambassador the business on which he came, in presence of their Majesties, and coincided with the Queen in her opinion that it would be *infra dig.* for her to enter into any treaty with the insurgent Lords. Mauvissière appears to have acted as their advocate in this matter, and urged the Queen not to decide the dispute with the sword. Mary told him "she was going to assemble her Council, to submit the question to the decision of these gentlemen; but she could assure him they were all preparing for arms, and hoped to be ready to march by the end of the month," adding, "that if it were their advice to give battle to the rebels, she intended to be there in person, with the King her husband."[2] "Supposing they were to be found equal to you in force, would you peril your life and crown on the hazard of a battle?" inquired the ambassador. "Yes," she replied; "I would, rather than not maintain my dignity as a Queen."

Of Darnley the following report is communicated: "As to the King of Scotland, it is not possible to see a more beautiful Prince, and he is accomplished in all courtly exercises. He wishes much that these enterprises were at an end, that he might go and see the King of France. He says 'he should like to have a good stud of horses, and means to buy some in France.' He replied with all suitable acknowledgments to the congratulations addressed to him on his marriage from the King, Charles IX., and professed a sincere desire to render any service in his power to his Majesty, and in all things to follow the example of the Kings of Scotland, his predecessors."[3]

[1] Despatches of Mauvissière de Castelnau and Paul de Foix to Charles IX., in Teulet's Pièces et Documens. [2] Ibid. [3] Ibid.

Mary, who was far from well at this time, complained much of pain in her heart, and faintness, which occasioned the report to be circulated that she was likely to give an heir to Scotland. The ambassador notices this, and "that she always wore a cloak." She treated him with great respect and consideration, assigned him his lodgings in Holyrood Abbey, and sent him every day a dish from her own kitchen. But she suspected his presence did her affairs no good; and he, notwithstanding all her courtesies, perceived she had a great wish for his departure. She showed him several letters written by the insurgents to their friends and relations in Edinburgh, which they had voluntarily brought to her;[1] on the other hand, she had the pain of discovering that several of the richest merchants in Edinburgh, who had, under the pretext of poverty, excused themselves from obliging her with a loan for the defence of her Crown, had been secretly assisting the insurgent Lords with large sums of money.[2] Seventeen of the offending parties were summoned to appear before their Majesties and the Privy Council; and some of them, refusing to obey, were brought forcibly. The Queen spoke them courteously, stating her need of pecuniary aid, and requested them to lend her a thousand marks. At the mention of this sum they all stood speechless; whereupon Sir James Balfour told them "they were very ill advised if they refused to grant what had been so civilly asked for by their Sovereign Lady, who had no occasion to stand on much ceremony with them, seeing that the greater number of them deserved to be hanged for sending that money to her rebels which they churlishly refused to her," and forthwith "caused them all to be warded in the Auld Tower, wherein my Lord of Moray used to lodge, till they thought better of the matter."[3] Six of the most contumacious were next day committed to Edinburgh Castle, with an intimation that they must prepare to undergo the law for the misdemeanour of which they had been guilty. On the third day they were glad

[1] Despatches of Mauvissière de Castelnau and Paul de Foix to Charles IX., in Teulet's Pièces et Documens. [2] Ibid.
[3] Diurnal of Occurrents. Knox, Hist. Ref. Scot. Council Register.

to compound the matter for the sum required, namely, 1000 marks. Those who had met the rebel Lords at Dumfries had to pay another 1000 marks,—a very light mulct for an overt act of treason; and well for them it was they had so merciful a Sovereign to deal with. A loan of 10,000 marks was amicably adjusted between the Queen and the Corporation of Edinburgh, on condition of her granting them the superiority of Leith.[1] The Queen had already pledged part of her jewels for 2000 marks—a sum, as Randolph sneeringly observes, very inadequate to her necessities, having so many soldiers to pay, and money not to be had in Edinburgh.[2]

Mary writes with ease and spirit, on the 1st of October, to Beton, archbishop of Glasgow, her ambassador at the Court of France, giving a brief sketch of the state of affairs at this stirring time: "As for our news, you know that Mauvissière had commission to mediate. This I willingly accepted in regard to the Queen my neighbour, but not between myself and my subjects. Conducting themselves as they have done, I would rather lose everything. I am sure you will have heard enough on this point from your brother, and since from Chalmers; and of late they have gone from bad to worse. They are now at Dumfries, and mean to remain there till I set out from hence: that will be to-morrow. Then I hear they intend for England, and expect to be strengthened against me with three hundred English harquebussiers, and vaunt of succour both by sea and land to maintain them against our army. This ought to be ready to march to-morrow, or the day after at the latest. The King and I intend to take the field in person."[3]

The royal writer proceeds to direct her minister to solicit pecuniary aid of the Court of France, and to keep a watchful eye on the intrigues of her rebels with the French Pro-

[1] It is worthy of notice that Captain Cockburn, in his letter to Cecil, grossly misrepresents these matters. He swells the number of the merchants to thirty, and the amount of the fine to £20,000, and shamelessly asserts that the Queen had previously extorted from them 14,000 marks.—State Paper Office MS.

[2] State Paper Office MS., Randolph to Cecil, Oct. 13, 1565.

[3] Queen Mary to Beton, Archbishop of Glasgow, Oct. 1—Labanoff.

testants. She had cause for this vigilance, as many of the Huguenot gentlemen, instead of minding their own business in France, had stolen over to Scotland, and were serving as volunteers under the banner of the insurgents. In case any one should attempt to misrepresent the cause of the differences between her rebels and herself to the Queen-mother of France, who at that time was, for political reasons, supporting the cause of the Reformation, Mary further instructs the reverend ambassador to state "that no changes had been made in religion, and that they had always had full liberty of conscience; but it was not that they meant, nor yet the good of the realm; and as to the marriage, those who were now objecting it, among their other pretences for troubling the peace of the realm, had in the first instance given their assent to it." She then reverts to the present aspect of her affairs: "Yesterday Drumlanric and Lochinvar sent to implore my pardon, and have offered to come and serve me, and break with the others, having perceived the wickedness of their designs. The traitor Maxwell, to his great disgrace, has basely violated his faith to me, and has sent his son as his pledge to England, undeterred by the remembrance of the treatment to which his other boy was exposed, of which he told me himself." [1]

Mary, notwithstanding her earnest desire of taking the field against the rebels on the 2d or 3d of October, found herself detained in Edinburgh till the 8th, on which day she wrote the following earnest letter of remonstrance to Queen Elizabeth:—

"Madame my Sister,—Not only by the report of your ministers, but of all those with whom you have been pleased to speak, I understand that you are offended without just cause against the King my husband and me; and, what is worse, that your ministers on the Borders are threatening to put to fire and sack those of our subjects who wish, accord-

[1] Mary here alludes to the fact that young Maxwell of Terregles had a narrow escape from sharing the fate of the other young Scotch hostages whom the Earl of Lennox, when in the service of Henry VIII., hanged at Carlisle, for he had the rope round his neck, as he himself records, but being a boy of only eleven years of age, the English soldiers would not allow his life to be sacrificed.

ing to their duty, to assist us against our rebels, instead of according the aid I had hoped from you, and which I protest before God I would have given to you had you been in like circumstances. Nevertheless, I cannot persuade myself that you, being so nearly related to me, would show so little regard to my cause as to place on an equality with me men in whom I am assured you will find in the end no more faith than I have done. If I be deceived in my opinion of your natural affection, I would at the least appeal, as behoves a good sister, to the duty which all Christian princes owe each other, lest you should find others take example from your conduct to do the like. And if you are pleased, which I cannot believe, to make common cause with my traitors, I shall regret to be compelled not to conceal from all the princes our allies this great wrong, which we are willing to impute to the fault of your officers, unless we have your plain declaration that it is so; assuring you that, if it is not, we shall remain as good neighbours and relations ought ever to be. And in this conclusion I shall pray God that he will give you, Madame, my sister, the prosperity and felicity you merit; praying you to credit all that the Sieur de Mauvissière will tell you from me.

"From Edinburgh, this viii of October.

"Your affectionate good sister and cousin,

"MARIE R."[1]

The same day Mary left Edinburgh with her consort and her army. Her ladies having flagged and hung back on the march during her first campaign, her Majesty determined not to expose them to the hardships, perils, and fatigues which she was herself resolved to share, if necessary, on this occasion, with the loyal muster who followed the Lion banner. She therefore took with her but one of her maids of honour, and this was doubtless Mary Seton, who never failed her royal mistress in times of difficulty.

A muster of eighteen thousand men had assembled at Biggar, in Lanarkshire, to meet and serve their Sovereign Lady, and at the head of this powerful army Mary entered Dumfries in triumph on the 12th of October. The rebel Lords fled at her approach across the English border, and took refuge at Carlisle. The history of this short successful campaign is thus quaintly summed up by Sir James Melville: "Her Majesty again convened forces to pursue them, and chased them here and there, till at length they were compelled to flee into England for refuge, to her who promised by her ambassadors 'to wear her crown in their

[1] From the original French, printed in Prince Labanoff, Recueil des Lettres de Marie Stuart.

defence, in case they were driven to any strait for their opposition unto the said marriage.'" [1]

Mary has been accused of a vindictive temper: if this had been the case, she had now full opportunity of exercising it on the men of Dumfries, where her rebels had been received and cherished for nearly a month; but not her greatest libellers, Buchanan and Randolph, nor even her arch-enemy Knox, bear record of a single act of vengeance on her part. No blood-stained scaffolds marked her triumph, nor were the gates and towers of her palaces loaded with the heads and mangled limbs of victims—such barbarities being opposed to the nature of Mary Stuart, whose leading characteristic was benevolence and feminine compassion. As an instance of her forgiving disposition, her conduct to Lord Maxwell of Terregles may be cited. He, though one of the Wardens of the Border, had entertained the insurgent Lords, subscribed with them, and spoken as highly against their enemies as any of themselves; he had even raised a troop of horse for their service with a thousand pounds of English money, which he had received for that purpose.[2] Mary had been greatly exasperated at his conduct, as may be seen by her mentioning him, on the 1st of October, in her letter to Beton, as "the traitor Maxwell." Yet when, on the retreat of his friend Moray and his confederates, he desired to return to his allegiance, and on the third day after the arrival of the Queen and her consort he was brought to them by the Earl of Bothwell and other nobles, who offered to become sureties for him, she graciously accepted his submission, and granted him pardon on condition of his being a faithful and obedient subject for the future. In token of reconciliation, she also accepted hospitality at his Castle of Lochmaben,[3]

[1] Melville's brother Robert, having been the agent employed by Moray and his friends to negotiate the disgraceful pact between them and the English Sovereign, our author himself, the fast friend of Moray withal, had full information on the subject, and expresses the most lively anger and astonishment at Elizabeth leaving her tools in the lurch after she had beguiled them into what he styles "their *fulische* enterprise."—Memoirs of Sir James Melville, p. 135.

[2] Knox, History of the Reformation in Scotland.

[3] Ibid. There is a tradition amongst the inhabitants of Lower Annandale, that the beautiful and rare fish which graces Lochmaben was in

where he banqueted her and Darnley for three days. It will be seen how nobly the clemency of Mary Stuart was requited by the faithful services rendered to her in the darkest season of her adversity by his eldest son, the Master of Maxwell, better known in history by the title of Lord Herries.

Mary's bloodless victory over her foes being achieved, she disbanded her army and returned in peace and joy to her metropolis with her husband, taking their way through Tweeddale and Peebles. She entered Edinburgh on the 18th of October, only ten days after she had left it to pursue the vigorous and successful enterprise against which Elizabeth of England, Paul de Foix, and Mauvissière, had so strenuously laboured to dissuade her. The event proved that Mary, in following the dictates of her own judgment, acted like a sagacious Sovereign. If she had permitted herself to be amused with treaties, carried on through the representatives of foreign princes, with armed insurgents, who had acted as the tools of that restless agitator Queen Elizabeth, her reign would have come to an inglorious close in the course of a few weeks.

The Earl of Morton and his kinsman Ruthven, though both serving in the royal army, were banded in the confederacy with their friend Moray and the other rebel Lords, but, to use a favourite expression of Randolph, "only made fair weather with the Queen till they could espy their time,"[1] to render their treason serviceable to their confederates. Mary and Darnley had seen such reason to suspect Morton, that on the 24th day of October he was, by the royal order, compelled to surrender the Castle of Tantallon to John Earl of Atholl, and George Drummond was

troduced there from France by Queen Mary. The vendace, as this fish is locally called, (*Coregonus albula* of naturalists), is from four to six inches long, of elegant shape, and remarkable for its extreme delicacy. So greatly is it relished that there is a local club which meets annually at Lochmaben to enjoy a dinner at which it forms a dish. The fish is certainly unknown in any other part of Scotland. The name is evidently derived from the French *vindoise*, or dace, to which this fish bears some resemblance from the whiteness of its scales. It can scarcely be supposed that Mary brought the vendace herself to Lochmaben, though she might have caused them to be procured for Lord Maxwell.

[1] Randolph to Cecil, Oct. 12—State Paper MS.

appointed by them Captain of that mighty fortress, the rightful patrimony of Darnley's mother, the Lady Margaret Douglas, Countess of Lennox.[1] This envied inheritance was also claimed by Ruthven, the husband of Janet Douglas, the elder daughter of the Lady Margaret's father by a previous tie, which the late Queen Margaret Tudor had, when she was tired of Angus, allowed to be a lawful marriage in order to dissolve her own. These complicated claims on the Angus honours and estates had a fatal influence on the destiny of him who, as the beloved consort of the Sovereign, occupied the most formidable position of the rival heirs of Angus. As long as Darnley was supported by the prudence and popularity of the Queen, and her love surrounded him with defences, it would have been impossible to harm him. The failure of the recent attempts against the royal pair had proved that other means than open violence must be resorted to, and that those who desired to destroy either or both must first divide the conjugal union in which their mutual strength consisted; for while that remained unbroken, Mary and Darnley stood on impregnable ground.

The first insinuation against Mary's reputation as a woman emanated from her base brother Moray, who consigned to the ready pen of Randolph the task of disseminating vague but malignant hints, tending to defame her, his sister and Sovereign, whom he dared neither face in the senate nor the field. The document wherein his mysterious aspersion against her is promulgated to Cecil, is dated the same day the news of the retreat of the rebel Lords from their last city of refuge in Scotland, Dumfries, and its occupation by their triumphant Sovereign, reached Edinburgh.[2] Finding themselves worsted in the game, they now resorted to the cowardly weapons of calumny, but calumny as yet nameless and undefined, to which inventive malice had not yet assigned a demonstrable shape. These are the prefatory notes of the embryo work of villany.

"The hatred conceived against my Lord of Moray is neither for his religion nor that which she now speaketh,

[1] Diurnal of Occurrents. [2] Randolph to Cecil, Oct. 13th.

that he would take the crown from her, as she hath said lately to myself, but that she knoweth that he understandeth some such secret part not to be named for reverence sake, that standeth not with her honour, which he so much detesteth, being her brother, that neither can he show himself as he hath done, nor she think of him but as one whom she mortally hateth. Here is the mischief—this is the grief—and how this may be solved and repaired it passeth, I trow, man's wit to consider. This *reverence*, for all that, he hath to his Sovereign, that I am sure there are *very few* that know this grief."[1]

The select few to whom Moray, in his tender care for his royal sister's honour, had confided the evil he pretended to have seen in her, were of course the agents he employed, like Randolph, to circulate his slanders, while affecting to lament her follies. The calumniator is but a bungler in his art who does not give himself credit for his friendly feelings towards the object of his malice, and profess that his tender affection for his victim is only surpassed by his love for truth. The part of a faithful brother would have been to conceal any failings he might have detected in his father's daughter; yet in the very face of these slanders the detailer of them adds, "And to have this obloquy and reproach of her removed that is now common, I believe he would quit his country all the days of his life."[2] To refrain from bearing false witness against her would have been a more consistent proof of Moray's regard for his royal sister; his absence profited her little, since his greatest villanies were always performed by deputy.

Randolph does not forget to mention the contest between Mary and Darnley, whether Lennox or Bothwell should be intrusted with the commandership-in-chief of the military force of the realm. He, too, had taken the liberty to remonstrate, in his Sovereign's name, against the appointment of the powerful Border chief to his old hereditary office as the guardian of the frontier; but Mary naturally regarded the objections of her English neighbour to Bothwell as strong arguments in favour of his fitness for the

[1] Randolph to Cecil, Oct. 13th. [2] Ibid.

post. Randolph assured her "that Bothwell had spoken despitefully, not only of Queen Elizabeth, but of herself." Mary listened with indifference,[1] and scarcely concealed the fact that the ill-will manifested by his royal mistress to Bothwell was the best voucher she could have of his integrity. Finding all he said only had the effect of inducing Mary to confirm her appointment, Randolph failed not to place improper constructions on her motives, although he at first confined himself to sarcastic generalities.

Mary's party in England had been so greatly strengthened by her political marriage with a Prince whose English birth and nurture naturally endeared him to the prejudices, as well as the affections, of a nation systematically opposed to foreign rulers, that her increasing popularity was regarded with great uneasiness by Elizabeth. The increase of power the late ineffectual attempts of Moray and his confederates to disturb her government had thrown into Mary's hands, together with the retreat of Moray and his troublesome faction clean out of her realm, had placed her in a formidable position. Her evident intention of keeping up a small standing army under the command of Bothwell, a man who, whatever were his evil qualities, was inaccessible to Cecil's bribes, intimated that she intended to carry herself as proudly as Elizabeth herself, and to stand henceforth, if occasion required, on the offensive as well as the defensive. There was not a sovereign in Europe who had governed with greater ability, or whose character for wisdom, virtue, and moderation, stood higher than that of Mary Stuart. Randolph, indeed, acting, as we have proved from his own showing, as the organ of her fraternal rival's malice, had commenced employing his lively pen in her depreciation, from the hour she declared her determination to act as a free Princess in regard to her marriage. The prospect of her union with Darnley proving fruitful created additional motives for defaming her, and the political libels contained in his letters to Cecil became daily more malignant. It is a curious study to trace the progress of these structures

[1] Randolph to Cecil, Oct. 13, 1565—State Paper MS., inedited.

of falsehood, on which, for want of due investigation, some of the heaviest charges against Mary have been based. Not the least important of the long series of Randolph's correspondence is a letter addressed by him to his old master, Leicester, in which he makes many shuffling apologies for the discrepancies between his former praises of Mary Stuart's excellencies and his present evil reports of her character and conduct. He declares "she is no longer the same Mary Stuart whom for four years he had almost daily scrutinised, and described as a creature whose perfections passed the belief of those who had not seen her. But this," he naïvely observes, "was at the time when he fancied she was going to marry his noble patron, and all the change he deplored was produced by her infatuation in becoming the wife of Darnley."[1]

As this remarkable document has escaped the attention of all Mary's previous historians, a few extracts from it may prove acceptable to the readers of this biography, by exposing the time-serving inconsistencies in Randolph's representations. "So long," he says, "as I did know that your lordship had credit in this Court, I took no small pleasure, from time to time, to let you understand the state thereof. Sometimes I wrote of the Queen's self, sometimes of the ladies and maidens. Then I thought myself happy, and that I led a good life, and in mine own conceit rejoiced not a little to think what life I should have led, if, through my service and travail, these two countries might have been united in one, and your lordship, to whom I am most bound, to enjoy the Queen thereof."[2] And here it is impossible not to ask, which Queen out of the twain was to have enjoyed both realms, as the wife of the fortunate Leicester? Either death to Mary or treason to Elizabeth must have been meditated. Randolph goes on to lament the change which, since that time, had come over the deluded Scottish Queen. "I may well say that a wilfuller woman, and one more wedded unto her own opinion, without order, reason, and discretion, I never did know or heard

[1] Randolph to the Earl of Leicester, October 18, 1565—State Paper Office MS., inedited.

[2] Ibid.

of. Her husband, in all these conditions, and many worse, far passeth herself; her Council, such men as never were esteemed for wisdom or honesty; herself, and all such as belong unto her, evil bruited and spoken of, that worse cannot be thought than is common in every man's mouth,"—who had been duly imbued with Moray's slanderous insinuations belike, and could believe her guilty of follies undefined. "These things," continues Randolph, "I doubt not but your lordship findeth strange, and specially to see *me* confirm the same! that so oftentimes, both in words and writing, have so far set forth her praises as my tongue would serve me to speak, or my wit to invent, in all rooms and places where I came—so far that in many places your lordship knoweth how hardly I was believed. I fear, therefore, I shall be reproved either for lack of constancy, that so far differ from my former opinion, or want of judgment, that could not so far see as that which now I find. To this I answer, that if I alone had so thought of her, and that the same had not been confirmed by many other, unto whom, in deep consideration of all cases of weight and persons they have to do with, I must of reason give place, it might well be thought that I was either overseen in judgment or unadvised in my reports. But if your lordship hath found that whatsoever I have spoken or written in her commendation was confirmed unto the whole world by others, many and divers, what can be judged of me but that, with them, I reported as I found, and that she is so much changed in her nature that she beareth only the shape of that woman she was before?"[1] The change was not in Mary, for natures grounded in early principles of goodness change not like dissolving views, according to the whim of the exhibitor, who converts an angel into a fiend, or an ostrich into a lion, in half a moment, by the magic of his art. Mary was still consistent with herself, and the same as when Randolph's reports of her echoed the praises of an admiring world; but the circumstances in which she now stood were altered: his pen had received a different

[1] Randolph to the Earl of Leicester, October 18, 1565—State Paper Office MS., inedited.

bias, and it had become with him a political duty to defame her. He facetiously assures Leicester, however, "that he would not have found himself beguiled if he had married Mary in consequence of his commendations, for all the evil that now appeared in her was the result of her disappointment in not getting so good a husband;" and, with one of his sarcastic sneers at women in general, audaciously adds, "that since she could not get him, she gave such liberty unto the general disposition that is in the whole kind, that she cared neither what became of herself or country. Neither," repeats Randolph with greater seriousness, "was I deceived in my former judgment of her, nor yet can I but lament her hard fortune and *defame*, to see her brought into that extremity that the great fame and bruit that she had gotten through virtue and worthiness is now clean fallen from her, as though neither the one nor the other had been known unto her." He then observes "how greatly it is misliked that a stranger, a varlet, should have the whole guiding of the Queen and country, which was the cause why the nobles were so aggrieved." Yet they had declared to the whole realm, that the Queen's marriage with Darnley, and the danger to be apprehended from his Popery, was the cause of their rebellion.

"The three Maries," continues Randolph, "remain yet unmarried, and heartily wish, long since, they had been wives. They are all good"—more than John Knox allows—"but the one most constant, stout, and wise, and thinketh her fortune so much the worse that mine is so evil." Our ambassador here speaks of Mary Beton, whom he courted and seduced from her duty to her royal mistress, but did not marry. "She knoweth herself bound unto your lordship," he tells Leicester, "and ready to do your lordship that humble service she may."[1] No good to Mary Stuart resulted from such alliances.

It would appear that Queen Mary about this period became aware of the superiority of Mary Seton, both in principles and conduct, to those light-minded coquettes,

[1] Randolph to the Earl of Leicester, October 18, 1565—State Paper Office MS., inedited.

Mary Beton and Mary Fleming, and selected her for her confidential attendant and travelling companion. "The rest of the Maries," observes Randolph, "are like to break their hearts to see their whole credit lost in Court."[1] It was time for the Queen to look with some degree of coolness and distrust on young ladies who had so far forgotten their duty to her and Scotland as to enter into disreputable flirtations and secret correspondences with the diplomatic spies of England. Mary Fleming was at this time sought in marriage by Lethington, who was regarded with well-deserved suspicion, in consequence of his intrigues with England. "My old friend Lid," writes Randolph, "hath leisure to make love, and in the end, I believe, as wise as he is, will show himself a very fool, or stark staring mad."[2]

Queen Mary remained quietly in Edinburgh with her husband till the 30th of October, when she honoured the Earl of Morton with a visit at Dalkeith. He played the host reluctantly, and grudged the expense of entertaining her for a day or two. "My Lord of Lennox," continues Randolph, "lieth still at Glasgow, to keep that country in obedience, but, as I hear, taketh from all men what he liketh. My Lord of Bothwell, for his great virtue, doth now govern all next unto the Earl of Atholl; the parson of Flisk (Sir James Balfour) flingeth at all men as he were wode. I speak not of David, for he that may attain to it is worthy to wear it." The innuendoes of our sarcastic diplomatist are somewhat discursive at this date, shooting at two marks —the secret confederacy for defamation of royalty not having decided whether to select the one-eyed Border chief, or the deformed Piedmontese Secretary, as the alleged object of the beauteous Mary's favour. They fixed on both successively, commencing with the latter, because his office necessarily required him to be frequently alone with the Queen in her cabinet, when reading and writing letters not of a nature to be confided to the friends and correspondents of Cecil. The vindictive hatred of Lethington—the most important department of whose office as Secretary of State

[1] Randolph to Cecil, Oct. 31, 1565—State Paper MS., inedited.

[2] Ibid.

had long been transferred to Riccio—was especially excited; while Morton, who suspected that his office of Lord-Chancellor was destined to reward the faithful services of this inconvenient foreign interloper, perceived that the only means of effecting his fall would be by exciting the political jealousy of Mary's consort against him, as a person possessing greater influence in her Councils than himself; and if, as from her firmness of character and high spirit it might be anticipated, she refused to dismiss him from her service, suspicions of a nature injurious to her honour were to be infused, the self-importance, weak judgment, and irascible temper of the boy-King rendering him a meet instrument for the purpose. The charm of novelty having worn off, Darnley had already begun to neglect his beautiful consort, affecting the society of roysterers of his own age, and preferring the excitement of the chase and field-sports to her company; nor was it possible to induce him to attend to the regular routine of business indispensably connected with the regal office. Like Robert the Unready, he was always out of the way when any matter of importance required his presence and attention.

Mary, on whose shoulders the cares and responsibilities of the government lay, awaited in anxious suspense intelligence of the line of conduct adopted by Queen Elizabeth towards her rebel Lords who had taken refuge in England. As these, however, had failed in their enterprise, and public opinion was in favour of Mary, not only in Scotland but in England also, they were unwelcome visitors to their royal ally, from whom they got nothing but scorn and incivility. "It was only," says Knox, "through his true friend, M. de Foix, the French ambassador, that Moray, after several repulses, obtained audience. Elizabeth asked him sternly, 'how he, a rebel to her sister of Scotland, durst take the boldness upon him to come into her realm?' These and the like words got he, instead of the good and courteous entertainment he expected.[1]" Such conduct in the presence of the ambassador, Moray might imagine, was a piece of acting, to screen him from the imputation of that basest

[1] Hist. Ref. Scot., vol. ii. p. 513—Wodrow edition.

phase of treason, having been suborned by a foreign power to trouble the peace of his native land; but she held the same language after de Foix had withdrawn, refusing to lend him or his confederates any support in their necessity, and denied point-blank that she had ever promised to aid them in any way; "albeit," continues our authority, "her greatest familiars knew the contrary. In the end the Earl of Moray said to her, 'Madam, whatsoever thing your Majesty meant in your heart we are thereof ignorant; but thus much we know assuredly, that we had lately faithful promises of aid and support from your ambassador and familiar servants, in your name; and further, we have your own handwriting confirming the said promises.'"[1] The sequel, though suppressed by Knox, must have been as well known to him as to Sir James Melville, who records the fact that Elizabeth insisted "that Moray and his companion should confess to her on their knees, in the presence of the French and Spanish ambassadors, that she had never moved them to that opposition and resistance to their Sovereign's marriage. This she desired to satisfy the said ambassadors, who both alleged in their masters' names that she was the cause of the late rebellion, and that her only delight was to stir up strife among her neighbours."[2] When Moray and Kilwinning entered to perform the parts assigned to them, they knelt, and Moray began his harangue in Scotch. Elizabeth, rudely interrupting him, bade him speak French. He objected his imperfect acquaintance with that language. "You understand it quite well enough for this purpose," rejoined she, and Moray submitted to repeat his lesson in concert with his colleague.[3] "Now," exclaimed Elizabeth, "ye have told the truth; for neither did I, nor any in my name, stir ye up against your Queen, for your abominable treason might serve for example to move my own subjects to rebel against me; therefore pack you out of my presence, ye are but unworthy traitors." "Howbeit," observes Melville, "she had promised anew to help

[1] Hist. Ref. Scot., vol. ii. p. 513. [2] Sir James Melville's Memoirs.
[3] Letter of Guzman de Silva to Philip II., Nov. 5, 1565—Archives of Simanças.

and assist them to the uttermost of their power, with condition that they would please her so far as to set down on their knees in presence of the said ambassadors, and make the foresaid false confession."[1] So much for the truth and honour of the blunt, honest Earl of Moray. Elizabeth understood his nature better than his royal sister, the kind and beneficent Sovereign whose benefits he repaid with treason and calumny, while to the imperious English despot he crouched like the beaten hound that licks the hand that castigates him. Elizabeth took great credit, in a letter she wrote to Mary, for the rating she had bestowed on these tools of her crooked policy. "I could have wished," writes she, "that your ears had been judges to hear both the honour and affection which I manifested towards you, to the complete disproof of what is stated, that I defended your rebel subjects against you, which will be always very far removed from my heart, it being too great an ignominy for a Princess, I will not say to do, but even to suffer."[2]

Whatever degree of credit Mary attached to the deceitful professions of her cousin Elizabeth, she was only too happy to be relieved of the apprehension of her bestowing rewards and flattering distinctions on Moray and his confederates. The welcome news of their discomfiture was despatched to her by the French ambassador. As soon as she had read the letters brought by his courier, she triumphantly published the gratifying intelligence to her Court, and ordered letters announcing the fact to be written, and forwarded to all parts of Scotland. Darnley was, as usual, absent on a hawking expedition, and not expected to return for five or six days. But Mary's pleasure was incomplete till she had made her husband participant of the joyful news. She sent an express in quest of him, and he returned to Holyrood Abbey at eleven o'clock that night; but though the next day was Sunday, not all the charms and endearments of his beauteous consort could detain him in Edinburgh. He left her at seven in the

[1] Sir James Melville's Memoirs, Bannatyne edition, p. 136.
[2] Elizabeth to Queen Mary, 29th October 1565—Labanoff's Appendix, vol. vii.

morning, and returned to his pastime in the country,[1] where he absented himself for several days, leaving Mary to hold her Councils and transact the most difficult affairs as best she might without him. The truant boy-Monarch was not the less prepared to vindicate his marital authority and regal dignity, by carping and cavilling at every measure adopted by his royal consort, with the advice of her Council, unless especially sanctioned by him.

[1] Randolph to Cecil, Nov. 8, 1565—State Paper MS. inedited.

MARY STUART

CHAPTER XX.

SUMMARY

Queen Mary embarrassed about her husband's regal title—It is disallowed by England—His dissipated habits—Business impeded by his neglect—Expedients adopted by the Queen—She retires to Linlithgow—She pardons the Duke of Châtelherault—Her husband and his father displeased at her clemency—Mary solicited on all sides to pardon Moray and the other rebels—Darnley objects—Dissensions between the royal pair—Darnley's discontent—Queen's poverty—She purposes resuming the Crown grants, and taking church-lands from laymen—Liberal sentiments of the Queen—Her consort's devotion to Church of Rome—Christmas observances—Queen's late hours at card-playing—Lovers' quarrels—The Mary Rial—Darnley leaves the Queen to meet his father at Peebles—His continued importunity for the crown-matrimonial—Mary likely to bring an heir to Scotland—Calumnies of Randolph—Mary writes to Queen Elizabeth to intercede for Fowler and Lady Lennox—Festivities at Holyrood—Arrival of Rambouillet—Darnley invested with the Order of St Michael—Darnley gives ill words to those who will not go to mass—Bothwell's sturdy Protestantism—Gay doings at the Court of Holyrood—Queen and Darnley perform a mask with David Riccio and others—Plot for the assassination of Riccio and dethronement of the Queen—Complicity of the English Cabinet—Darnley's habits of intoxication—His misconduct to the Queen—Randolph's tricks detected—His vindictive malice and false reports—Festivities given by Queen Mary and Darnley in honour of Bothwell's marriage to Lady Jane Gordon.

SCARCELY had Mary congratulated herself on the discomfiture of her rebel Lords, and the friendly professions of Queen Elizabeth to herself, ere that subtle Princess prepared to annoy her on the delicate point of her consort's regality, by instructing Randolph to demand a safe-conduct for two gentlemen whom she desired to send on an especial mission

to her. Mary was perfectly willing to grant the safe-conduct, but etiquette required it should be signed by Darnley as well as herself; and Randolph said, "that as his royal mistress had not acknowledged him for King, and wrote of him in her letter as 'the Lord Darnley,' he could in no case accept it in his name." "I had much ado with her in this matter," observes our diplomatist, "even to very sharp words to myself and my Lord Bedford, that refused to keep the days of truce in his name. The matter was debated in Council, where it was concluded, after great debate, that I should have my obstinate will, notwithstanding all former promises made to the King that no act should pass, or public instrument, that his hand should not be at it."[1] The decision of the Council, that it was wiser to concede the point than to enter into a quarrel with so formidable a neighbour as Elizabeth, was made on the 5th of November, in Darnley's absence. Mary's situation is mentioned by Randolph, as a certainty, in his letter of the 12th, and that she had already made choice of a nurse. He omits not to couple that intelligence with insinuations, the vagueness of which ought to satisfy every candid reader that he was destitute of any foundation on which to build a slander: "I will not," continues he, "write of *brutes* or tales, but assuredly men here have great liberty to speak, as also it may be free for you to think what you like."[2]

At this period Mary's father-in-law, the Earl of Lennox, the Earls of Atholl, Cassillis, and divers others, went openly with her and her consort to attend the mass in her chapel. The Earls of Huntley and Bothwell refused to oblige her by that compliance.[3] "As for the King," continues our authority, "he past his time in hunting and hawking, and such other pleasures as were agreeable to his appetite, having in his company gentlemen willing to satisfy his will and affections."[4] In order to join companions, whose society had greater attractions for Darnley than that of the

[1] Randolph to Cecil, Nov. 8, 1565—State Paper Office MS., inedited. See also the proceedings of the Privy Council, Nov. 5—Printed in Keith, 318.

[2] Randolph to Cecil, Nov. 19, 1565—State Paper Office MS., inedited.

[3] Knox, Hist. Ref. Scot. [4] Ibid.

most beautiful and accomplished princess in Europe, he departed on the 19th of November into Fifeshire, to pass his time for eight or ten days, leaving Mary seriously ill, having kept her chamber, and mostly her bed, five days, with the grievous pain in the side which generally attacked her at that time of the year. The frequent absences of the reckless partner whom she had in evil hour associated with herself in her regal office, placed Mary in a painful dilemma between her duty to her realm and her respect for him; for either the whole business of the state must come to a dead stop while awaiting the leisure and convenience of the truant boy-King, or she must treat him as a nullity, by exercising the functions of government without his personal co-operation. With feminine adroitness, she endeavoured to evade these distressing alternatives, and to keep her promise that her husband's hand should be affixed to all public acts and deeds, by having an iron stamp made with the fac-simile of his signature, which, after she had written her own name, was affixed in her presence by her Secretary, and his confidential friend, David Riccio, to such papers as required immediate despatch,[1] and could not tarry for his uncertain return. This arrangement was made, even Buchanan admits, with Darnley's consent, that he might be free to enjoy his pleasure without impeding the necessary course of business; for the Queen had represented to him, "that while he was busy hawking and hunting, matters of importance were unseasonably delayed, and sometimes wholly omitted."[2] Such, then, is the simple, and surely satisfactory explanation of a circumstance which the same writer has, with all the

[1] Knox. Buchanan. Goodall, indeed, who devoted the latter years of his life to the examination of the documents of Mary's reign, throws serious doubts on the existence of the stamp, and declares that he never succeeded in discovering any paper or parchment with a vestige of the impression of such an instrument, though he had seen many papers signed by Mary with a blank left for her husband's name. Under these circumstances, the story, being unverified for want of tangible proof, rests on the authority of Knox and Buchanan, who relate it to Mary's prejudice. It appears, nevertheless, to have been a matter of necessity, and the only expedient she could possibly adopt, without entirely ignoring the political existence of her matrimonial partner.

[2] Buchanan, History of Scotland.

shameless hardihood of falsehood, cited as an instance of Mary's injurious treatment of her husband, asserting that it was to defraud him of his proper share in public business, and this in the face of the previous statement, that Darnley preferred his pastimes to the restraint and trouble of performing these duties. It was, however, in his absence only, and then as a matter of necessity, that recourse was had to this expedient, which effectually preserved his regal identity to the world; for in proclamations, and other printed papers, one or two persons at the utmost would be aware that the King's name was not an autograph signature. Existing documents afford abundant proof, that whenever he and the Queen were together, his name was written by his own hand always after hers, which, contrary to the hackneyed assertion repeated by persons who never saw the letters and warrants signed by the royal pair, it was from the period of their marriage. Mary Stuart was the last Princess in the world who would have violated an etiquette established by herself, or lowered her own dignity, and weakened her party in England, by any act tending to deteriorate the father of the child whose birth she expected would be followed by their recognition as the presumptive heirs of the English crown. Arguments are, however, needless when the papers themselves demonstrate the fact, that no change did take place in the order of their signatures —for Mary's name always had stood first, as in reason it would, her husband's regality being entirely from her favour. Of all the troubles which beset the thorny path of Queen Mary Stuart, the regal title she had, in evil hour for both, conferred on Darnley, was the most perplexing, not only in regard to her relations with Elizabeth, who never ceased to harp on this discordant string, but as entangling the business of government with delays and difficulties of the most embarrassing nature, and, worse than all, inflaming the pride and exciting the ambition of a selfish, petulant young man, devoid alike of gratitude and judgment.

Mary remained sick and lonely at Holyrood till the 3d of December, when, finding herself able to undertake that short journey, she went to Linlithgow for change of air, in

the hope also of meeting her truant husband. "She is gone to be very quiet," writes Randolph, "and will have no repair. A few in number convoyed her out of this town, and the most part are come back again. She hath taken with her only the women of her chamber, because she would be the more quiet."[1] On account of her situation, Mary travelled in her horse-litter.

Rejoicing in the prospect of domestic disquiet for the young royal matron, Randolph observes: "I see no great likelihood of long accord between her father-in-law, the Earl of Lennox, and her, of whom she hath already wished 'that he had not set his foot in Scotland for her days.'" Mary had only too much reason to feel this; for the presence of Lennox was fatal to her hopes of wedded happiness—his selfish ambition being the exciting cause of his son's importunities for her to grant him the matrimonial crown, meaning no less than that she should depute to him the whole executive power of the government in right of being her husband, while she sank into the inferior position of a Queen-consort.

Mary mortally offended Lennox, and displeased her husband, by accepting the humble submission of the Duke of Châtelherault, and allowing him, his sons and kinsmen, to retain their estates, and according her pardon for their offences, on condition of his putting his castles of Hamilton and Draffen into her hands, and living in voluntary exile for five years.[2] In consequence of this act of royal clemency, Lennox found himself disappointed of the revenge he had hoarded for three-and-twenty years against his rival kinsman, and lost the opportunity of appropriating the earldom of Arran, and filling his empty coffers with the wealth of the hated Hamiltons, on whose fat forfeitures he, as the nearest of kin, had fixed his affections. The ill-will of both father and son to David Riccio was first incurred by his refusing to assist them in compassing the ruin of the Hamiltons, and advising the Queen to follow the dictates of womanly compassion and princely magnanimity, by extending

[1] Randolph to Cecil, Dec. 3, 1565—State Paper Office MS., inedited.
[2] Diurnal of Occurrents. Chalmers.

her grace to her fallen foes instead of pressing too hardly upon them.[1] It has been the fashion with modern historians to censure Mary for not listening to the solicitations made to her from Queen Elizabeth, and certain of her own servants, for the pardon and restoration of Moray and the other rebel Lords, who were at this time living at Newcastle on the niggard alms of the English Sovereign. But as Mary had absolved them for their treasonable league with England on her first return to her own realm, on condition of their refraining from such practices for the future, and they had ungratefully returned to the like doings by making themselves the instruments of "the ancient enemy," for disturbing the peace of their native land, it is unreasonable to blame her for wishing to keep them at a distance.

Sir James Melville mentions, that finding himself coldly treated by both Mary and Darnley, on account of his known friendship with Moray, and perceiving that dangerous times were at hand, he asked permission to go abroad. The Queen said, "he might do her good service at home if he pleased," observing, that "he had ceased to tell her what he thought of her proceedings." He said, "he feared his opinions might be unpleasant to her Majesty."[2] Mary assured him to the contrary, but said, "he had enemies, who did what they could to put him in suspicion with the King, as being a favourer of the Earl of Moray, which she had put out of his Majesty's head, knowing that Melville had a liking for Moray but not for his doings, and was sure," continues Melville, "'that I loved her ten times better than him;' and said, 'that if as much evil were spoken of her to me as of me to her, she would wish I should give them no more credit against her than she did against me.' She desired me 'to wait upon the King, who was yet but young, and to give him and her good advice, as I was wont to do, that might help her to eschew all apparent inconveniences;' and gave me her hand 'that she should take in good part whatever I spoke, as proceeding from a loving and faithful servant,' willing me also 'to be friend unto

[1] Memorial for Cosmo, Duke of Tuscany, in Labanoff, Appendix, vol. vii.
[2] Sir James Melville's Memoirs, Bannatyne edition.

Seigneur David, who was hated without cause.' The King also told me what they were that had spoken in my contrary, and said; 'that they were known to be such common liars as their tongues were no slander.'"[1]

Melville availed himself of the liberty Queen Mary had given him to plead the cause of his friend Moray, artfully representing to her, "that since the Queen of England had dealt so uncourteously with that nobleman before the ambassadors, and broken all her fine promises to him and the other associate Lords, that she should take that opportunity of conciliating him, and proving how much better her service was than that of the English Sovereign."[2] The moral justice in Mary's character revolted from this idea. She would not listen to the suggestion of receiving to her grace those traitors, after they had been publicly disgraced by their employer. Melville urged the impolicy of driving them to despair, and insinuated that they might cause her some trouble by their enterprises. "I defy them," exclaimed Mary, with a burst of right royal spirit. "What should they do, and what dare they to do?"—"Madam," rejoined Melville, "with your Majesty's pardon, my proposition is but following your commandment to show you my opinion on all occasions for the weal of your service." Mary thanked him, and granted the advice was good, but said "she could not find it in her heart to have ado with any of them, for divers respects." Melville told her he had heard wide speeches of strange things that might befall ere the Parliament she was about to summon ended. "After I had been this way in hand with her Majesty," continues he, "I entered with Sir David in the same manner, for then he and I were under good friendship; but he disdained all danger, and despised counsel, so that I was compelled to say 'I feared late repentance.'"[3] This observation clearly indicates that Melville knew of the plot against the Italian Secretary, whose death was determined by the rebel Lords and their faction long before they had succeeded in exciting first the political, and then the per-

[1] Sir James Melville's Memoirs, Bannatyne edition.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid. p. 140.

sonal, jealousy of the King. In fact, Melville subsequently reminded Mary "that he had warned both Riccio and herself of what was in preparation, in case they proceeded to extremities in regard to the forfaulture of the rebel Lords at the Parliament she had summoned avowedly for that purpose."[1]

Sir Nicholas Throckmorton wrote a very plausible letter to Mary, advising her to pardon and restore the rebels as a measure of good policy, tending to enhance her popularity with the English, "who shall think themselves," he observes, "in happy estate if they should come under the obedience of so benign a Princess, who can find it in her heart so well to forgive when men become recreant. For albeit it cannot be denied but my Lord Moray hath misused himself to your Majesty, and your Majesty has good cause to be offended with him, yet it is hard to persuade the Protestants some part of his grief is not for religion." This reasoning made great impression on Mary, "as well," observes Melville, "for the good opinion she had of him that sent it, as being of her own nature more inclined to mercy than to rigour, together that she was wise, and perceived a weal thereby unto the advancement of her affairs in England. She took a resolution to follow this advice, and to postpone the Parliament that was set to forfault the Lords that were fled. Seigneur David appeared to be also won to the same effect; for my Lord Moray had suited him very earnestly, and more humbly than any man would have believed, with the present of a fair diamond enclosed within a letter full of repentance and fair promises from that time forth to be his friend and protector,[2] which the said David granted to do with the better will that he perceived the King to bear him little good-will, and to glowm upon him." But Darnley would not allow the Queen to extend her grace to Moray.

The excessive intimacy which subsisted between Darnley and Riccio, both before and after the Queen's marriage, was first broken by Riccio refusing to accompany that misconducted prince to disorderly houses, to join in his inebri-

[1] Sir James Melville's Memoirs, p. 140.

[2] Ibid.

ate revels.[1] Darnley took umbrage at this, and was at no pains to conceal his hostility. As soon as this was observed, every means was used by his maternal kinsmen, Morton, Ruthven, and George Douglas, commonly called the Postulate—an illegitimate son of his grandfather, the late Earl of Angus—to inflame his mind against the luckless little Secretary, as a person whom they pretended possessed greater influence with the Queen than himself, and who was, they persuaded him, the cause why the Queen did not give him the crown-matrimonial of Scotland.[2] Darnley demanded this of Mary with the most vexatious and angry importunity. The joint sovereignty which, as far as her power went, she had bestowed upon him satisfied him not. He would be all or nothing, acting always as the spirit of his family *mot* dictated: "*Avant Darnlé—Jamais darrière!*" He considered himself an injured person that no arrangements had been made for his coronation, without pausing to inquire how the funds for so expensive a ceremonial were to be provided.

Mary had exhausted all the resources of the Crown, as well as the personal income she derived from her jointure, in paying her levies for the suppression of the rebellion. Randolph, who had by some means probed the depth of her purse, triumphantly assures Cecil "that money she had none, except about fifteen hundred francs which had been sent her out of France," adding that "three great horses had been bought in that country by the Lord Seton, and presented to Darnley."[3] It was impossible for an income to be assigned to him till the Parliament met; he was, therefore, for the present entirely dependent on the liberality of his consort, and she was almost in a state of insolvency at this period. She would have had more to supply the cravings of her penniless spouse if she had been less lavish of her grants to her ungrateful brother Moray, and other recipients of her royal bounty, who had devoured the larger portion of the Crown-lands during her minority. The laws of Scotland had wisely provided that

[illegible]s Elizabeth. [2] Lives of the Douglases, by Hume of Godscroft.
[3] Randolph to Cecil, Dec. 25, 1565—State Paper MS., inedited.

the Sovereign, on arriving at years of discretion, might revoke, with consent of Parliament, all grants of such property. Mary had completed her twenty-third year in this December, and did not disguise her intention of availing herself of that privilege for the relief of her pecuniary distress. Nor was this the only cause of alarm to the selfish and unjust legislators who had imposed on the youth and inexperience of their liege lady, for it was suspected that she contemplated causing a parliamentary investigation to be made of the titles of the lay abbots, priors, commendators, and bishops, to retain the ecclesiastical domains and jurisdictions they had appropriated to themselves within the last six years. The reluctance of the greedy impropriators to relinquish their prey, presented a serious obstacle to Mary's desire of applying this vast fund to the general good, instead of allowing it to be a source of individual benefit to persons who had made the sacred name of zeal for religion a pretext for increasing their own estates.

The Queen purposed annexing the whole of the vacant Church property to the Crown, for the maintenance of the working clergy—including those of her own Church in districts where it was, as in Aberdeenshire and the Highlands, the predominant faith. Parochial schools, collegiate institutions, were also to be established, as well as hospitals for the sick and destitute; and the surplus was to be employed in the business of government, and the defence of the realm, and thus to supersede the unpopular necessity of raising taxes. If this project could have been accomplished by Mary, she might have rendered herself the greatest female Sovereign the world ever saw; but though the hearts of her people were hers, her nobles were, for the most part, alarmed at the prospect of any measure likely to deprive them of any portion of their prey. It was only by the aid of the middle class—that scarcely recognised yet mighty centrifugal power, whose political views are always based on principles of moral justice—that Mary Stuart could have hoped to achieve her object, and check the increasing tyranny of the oligarchy. A fragment has been preserved among her private memorandums on the

duties of a sovereign, containing two remarkable sentences illustrative of her private opinion in regard to the privileges of hereditary rank, and her enlightened ideas as to the claims of real merit. "What ought a monarch to do," she inquires, "if his ancestor have ennobled a man of worth, whose offspring has become degenerate? Must it be that the monarch is compelled to hold in like esteem with the wise and valiant father, the son who is undeserving, selfish, and a violator of the laws? If, on the other hand, the monarch find a man of low degree, poor in this world's goods, but of a generous spirit and faithful heart, and fitted for the service he requires, may he not venture to put such a one in authority, because the nobles, having formerly monopolised all offices, desire to do so still?"[1]

In what hands could the liberties of a realm have been safer than in those of a Princess whose mind voluntarily recognised a principle to which monarchs generally remain impervious, till involved in the convulsions of a revolutionary struggle, brought on by succumbing to the selfishness of oligarchical legislation? Mary Stuart possessed regnal talent and personal energy enough to have remodelled the defective constitution of Scotland, and she would have been supported by the centrifugal force of her people, if she had been of the same religion with them; but the bondage of the most corrupt form of the Latin Church had been too recently broken for the fierceness of the passions excited by the struggle to have subsided; and much as Mary was herself beloved and revered, the influence of her spiritual counsellors was regarded with jealous distrust. Besides, Mary was no longer a perfectly free agent, having entangled herself with a headstrong boy-husband, who at this time not only made a most ostentatious parade of his unpopular mode of worship, but declared his intention of re-establishing it as the national faith in Scotland.

On the Christmas eve Darnley attended the midnight mass in the Chapel-royal at Holyrood, was at matins before day, and heard the high mass devoutly on his knees; while Mary, for the first time in her life neglecting these services,

[1] Labanoff's Recueil des Lettres de Marie Stuart, Appendix.

is said to have employed the chief part of the night in playing cards.[1] "Howsoever," continues our authority, "of some men these things are liked, it breedeth here a great suspicion that they are both enemies to God's word, and seek but their time how the same may be clean thrust out of this country."[2] The differences between the royal pair, though quite sufficient to infuse acerbity in the cup of wedded love, had not at this period arisen to any serious height; for Randolph sarcastically observes, "Some private disorders there are among themselves, but because they may be but *amantium iræ*, or household words as poor men speak, it maketh no matter if it grow no farther." Too many evil-minded men there were, who made it their business to inflame these lovers' quarrels into feelings of reciprocal anger and disdain.

A medal had been struck in honour of Mary's marriage with her English cousin, charged with the profiles of the royal pair facing each other, and surrounded with the legendary superscription, surmounted by a thistle, of "Henricus, Maria, D. G. Scotorum R^e. R.;"[3] but Darnley's portrait was never impressed on the current coin of the realm, neither did his name ever stand before the Queen's upon it; although Randolph, in the letter mentioning their lovers' quarrels, asserts "that the money was coined, when they first married, with both their faces, and his name first, and that this was called in, and the alteration made in the new coinage," of which he sends Cecil a specimen, describing its weight and value. This was the first large silver piece ever coined in Scotland, called the Mary Rial, and by some the Cruickston dollar, from the popular idea that the crowned palm-tree on the reverse was intended to represent the famous Cruickston yew growing beneath the walls of the ancestral seat of the Stuarts of Lennox and Darnley, Cruickston Castle—the motto, "*Dat gloria viris*,"[4] being evi-

[1] Randolph to Cecil, Dec. 25, 1565—State Paper MS. [2] Ibid.
[3] Nicholson's Coins of Scotland. The act for the coinage of the Rial is dated Dec. 22, 1565.
[4] For an engraving of Mary's bridal medal, with the profile portraits of herself and Darnley, see Letters of Mary Stuart, edited by Agnes Strickland, second edition.

dently intended for a compliment to the King-consort, but a palm-tree it undoubtedly is; and the circumscription "*Exurgat . Deus . et . dissipantur . inimici . ejus .*"[1] On the reverse is a shield with the royal arms, surmounted by a close crown, and supported by a thistle on either side, with the names, "Maria et Henricus, Dei gratia Regina et Rex Scotorum."

A coin with the faces of the royal pair, and the name of Henry preceding Mary, Randolph might describe, but could not send to Cecil, because it was simply the coinage of his own inventive brain, and not of Mary's mint. This numismatic myth, which has passed current in history for nearly three centuries, never formed part of the currency of Scotland, not even in Mary's honeymoon, when her weakness for her bonny bridegroom was at its height. She was in great want of money at that time, but too poor to have the power of coining any. The active exertions requisite for putting down the insurrection occupied her attention, and the Mary Rial was the first issue of money subsequent to her marriage with Darnley. The vulgar errors of history are always based on political falsehoods, established by the hardihood of assertion, and perpetuated by the indolence of writers, who find it easier and more profitable work to take things as they find them, than putting themselves to the trouble of testing their verity.

Soon after Christmas, Darnley, in sullen mood with his consort for withholding what she had no power to confer—the crown-matrimonial of Scotland—withdrew himself from her conjugal society, and went into Peeblesshire, with a few of his intimate associates, in quest of amusement more to his taste than the princely pleasures of Holyrood. Buchanan asserts that this was a compulsory absence on the part of Darnley, pretending that "he was sent there by the Queen, with a very small retinue, to be out of the way;" adding, "that as the snow soon after fell in great quantities," a contingency for which Mary seems to have been considered answerable, "he would have been in want of the necessaries of life, if the Bishop of Orkney had not brought him some

[1] By Arnot translated, "Let God arise, and let his enemies be scattered."

wine and other provisions."[1] Any comment on the absurdity of such a tale is rendered needless by the evidence of a letter from the Earl of Lennox to his son, proving that Darnley, who certainly had a will of his own, had announced that it was his pleasure to proceed to Peebles, and spend some time there, several days before it was possible, on account of the bad weather, to undertake that short journey from Edinburgh; and that the principal object of the expedition was a meeting between the father and son, probably unknown to the Queen, who was not on friendly terms with Lennox just then. This letter bears too importantly on the question of the credibility of the charges brought against Mary Stuart to be omitted; for, without even mentioning her name, it exonerates her from one of Buchanan's twice-repeated calumnies, and thus, by the righteous law of evidence, nullifies every other deposition of a witness so malignant and untruthful.

THE EARL OF LENNOX TO HIS SON KING HENRY.[2]

"SIR,—I have received by my servant Nisbet your natural and kind letter, for the which I humbly thank your Majesty; and as to the contents thereof, I will not trouble you therein, but defer the same till I wait upon your Majesty at Peebles, which shall be so soon as I may hear of the certainty of your going thither. And for that the extremity of the stormy weather causes me to doubt of your setting forward so soon on your journey, therefore I stay till I hear farther from your Majesty, which I shall humbly beseech you I may, and I shall not fail to wait upon you accordingly. Thus committing your Majesty to the blessing and governance of Almighty God, who preserve you in health, long life, and happy reign.

"From Glasgow, this 26th day of December.

"Your Majesty's humble subject and father,

"MATHEW LEVENAX.

"I shall desire your Majesty to pardon me in that this letter is not written of mine own hand, for truly at the writing hereof a pain which I have in my shoulder and arm is the cause thereof."

Endorsed—"To the King's Majesty."

The servile prostration of style adopted by Lennox in addressing his son, at a period when the most absolute submission was claimed by parents from their children, indicates the arrogant temper of the spoiled child, who could exact

[1] Buchanan, Hist. Scot., vol. ii. p. 307. Also repeated in The Detection, by the same author, with exaggerations.

[2] Preface to Keith, from the Archives of the Scotch College, Paris.

such unbecoming homage from his father. He probably expected no less from his royal wife. Some dissension, however, there had been between the father and son in the month of September, when Lennox, wearied of the overweening insolence and tyranny of the boy-King, departed from Court in disgust.[1] The object of Darnley's expedition to Peebles, whatever it might be, did not detain him many days, for he was again in Edinburgh, and tormenting Mary, with the petulant importunity of a spoiled child, for the matrimonial crown the second week in January. On the 16th of that month Randolph writes—

"The Court of long time hath been very quiet, small resort of any, and many of those that come but slenderly welcome, for the great and importune suit made by them for my Lord Moray and the rest, who by no means can find any favour at her Grace's hands, insomuch that Robert Melvin hath received for resolute answer, 'that, let the Queen of England do what she will for them, they shall never live in Scotland and she together.'"[2]

The unfortunate differences between Mary and Darnley appear to have increased at this time; but Randolph, though he had been for the last eight months the great political organ for defamation of the Queen of Scots, attributes no blame to her on this occasion, but merely says, "I cannot tell what misliking of late there hath been between her Grace and her husband: he presseth earnestly for the matrimonial crown, which she is loth hastily to grant, but willing to keep somewhat in store, until she know how well he is worthy to enjoy such a sovereignty."[3]

Mary's appointment of Lord Home and the Laird of Cessford to the wardenship of the southern Border displeased Elizabeth, who always objected to men who were inaccessible to her bribes; accordingly, she instructed Randolph to present a remonstrance against the appointment. Randolph being as usual most importunate for audience whenever it was inconvenient for Mary to attend to busi-

[1] Strype's Annals.
[2] Randolph to Cecil, Jan. 16, 1566—Stevenson's Illustrations.
[3] Ibid.

ness, she was under the necessity of receiving him, as she often did when not well enough to rise, in her bed-chamber. She apologised "for being in bed, for that she had not slept that night;" and such was the coarseness of the times, that the ambassador made a facetious allusion to her Majesty's situation as the probable cause of her unrest; on which she smiled, and said, "Indeed, I may now speak with more assurance than before I did, and think myself more out of doubt that it should be as you think." [1]

It was clearly too much to Mary's interest as a Sovereign of Scotland, and the next in blood to the English succession, to give publicity to the prospect of an heir, for her, by any affected reserves of false delicacy, to allow doubts to be entertained on that subject. Randolph, nevertheless, scruples not in his reports to Cecil to insinuate that it was not so. Nothing can, indeed, afford more convincing proof of the hostility which at this period animated his pen against Mary, than his endeavours to discredit her hopes of maternity. The certainty of these had, however, been triumphantly announced on the 19th of December by the Earl of Lennox to his imprisoned Countess, as the best comfort he could impart to cheer her woeful captivity. His letter was intercepted by Queen Elizabeth, who threatened to hang the bearer. A temporary reconciliation between Mary and Lennox appears to have taken place after the meeting of the father and son at Peebles, for Lennox was at the Court of Holyrood early in February, and an active assistant at the Roman Catholic services in the Chapel-royal.

Mary despatched Robert Melville to England on the 2d of that month with a friendly letter to Queen Elizabeth, expressive of her desire for an improvement of all amicable relations between them, and also to intercede for Fowler, one of Darnley's attendants, who had lately been arrested in England, and sentenced to be hanged without a trial. Mary introduces the subject with her usual tact and delicacy, as a report which came, she understood, "from Randolph's people, who have always shown," she says, "ill-will against the poor servants of the King my husband. I have much

[1] Randolph to Cecil, January 29, 1566—Stevenson's Illustrations.

wished to put in a word to you, which is that *Foulart* (Fowler), a poor servant, having for some cause withdrawn himself from the service of the King my husband without my knowledge, and having fallen into the hands of your officers, you have ordered him to be executed. This I cannot credit, seeing that to those who have been traitors to you, you have always shown yourself very compassionate in regard to life; and this person has not, I understand, committed any offence against you, farther than having followed his master as a poor servant trusted by him. It seems to me that I can justly entreat of you to delay his execution, if he have not attempted anything against your crown, your person, or your ministers; for if he be found guilty of the least of these points, I would not speak for him. But if he have committed any sin beyond assisting to promote his master's interest by following him, or I thought he had any other fault, I promise you I would not intercede with you in his favour, but give him up to summary justice, not wishing ever to make such requests as I would not like to be preferred to myself. Beyond the performance of my duty of pity, as God can witness, I take no other interest in him than having seen him as the servant of my husband."[1] Mary's earnest intercession in behalf of Fowler was in accordance with the benevolence of her nature; but she might have spared herself the trouble of her supplication, had she known that he was in no real danger, being a vile spy of Elizabeth's own, whose threats against him were mere grimace. In the same letter Mary addresses a brief but touching appeal to Elizabeth in behalf of her mother-in-law, the Countess of Lennox, then in great trouble, and suffering in consequence of the strictness of her confinement.[2] "Alas, my good sister," observes the

[1] Labanoff's Recueil des Lettres de Marie Stuart, vol. i.

[2] The hard usage of the luckless object of Mary's sympathy is thus recorded by an eye-witness of her sufferings: "I have done all the good offices I could think of for my lady the Countess of Lennox, captive in the Tower. Having found means to visit her very often, and to send her the news, and, inasmuch as her goods are seized, and as I understand her ill-treatment extends even to her victuals and drink, I have offered to succour her in that, and to assist her with money, although in that I am

royal pleader, "think, and without passion, if she wished well to her child, whether that deserves punishment; for I am assured that she cannot be found guilty of any act contrary to your inclination."

Mary's intended intercession for her husband's mother was betrayed to Randolph, before her accredited messenger, Robert Melville, left Edinburgh, and the fact was instantly communicated to Sir Nicholas Throckmorton by that malign busybody, for the purpose of circumventing any good effect that might otherwise have been produced by her appeal in behalf of the desolate captive. "One part of Robert Melville's commission," he writes, "is to have my Lady Lennox delivered. As good were it for you to set the *muckle divil* at liberty; for as much can the one do as the other. This Queen would fain be quit of her goodfather, the Earl of Lennox, and hopeth to have him restored. If you be as circumspect to call him home as you were unadvised to send him hither, I doubt not but in short time you will have your country in as good case as his coming hath brought this into."[1] Mary's petition was of course unavailing, and Darnley's mother continued to languish in hopeless durance.

February was a gay and festive month at Holyrood, in consequence of the arrival of Rambouillet, the French ambassador, who came, on the part of the King his master, to compliment Darnley with the investiture of the Order of St Michael. Rambouillet passed through England on his way, and tarried at Elizabeth's Court for a few days, to admit the Duke of Norfolk and the Earl of Leicester into the companionship of the same order. He had been requested to intercede with Mary for the rebel Scotch Lords by Elizabeth and the French ambassador at her Court, Paul de Foix, the fast friend of Moray; and we find, from an unpublished letter from Randolph to Throck-

myself very badly off; but in such a case as that I am willing to sell even my plate, and to employ all the credit I have, which is, I fancy, what I shall have to do."—Despatches of Paul de Foix — Letter to the King of France, Oct. 11, 1565. Pièces et Documens relatifs des Affaires Escosses, par M. Teulet, vol. ii. p. 94.

[1] Inedited Letter of Randolph to Throckmorton, Feb. 7, 1565-6—Advocates' Library, Edinburgh.

morton, that a personal interview actually took place between Moray and Rambouillet at Newcastle, at which Moray besought him to endeavour to obtain his pardon and recall, making great professions of loyal affection for his royal sister and his future good conduct, if she would restore him to her favour. Mary had given tokens of relenting, for she had ceased to speak of him with bitterness, and had prorogued the Parliament—summoned to meet on the 7th of February, for the express purpose of passing the acts of attainder—till the 12th of March.[1] Yet when sixteen of the Earl of Glencairn's friends came in a body to Court, and offered on their knees a supplication in favour of that nobleman—who, it may be remembered, acted as Darnley's cup-bearer at the nuptials, and a few days afterwards joined the rebels, with whom he was in secret league—Mary, unable to repress her indignant sense of the treachery of his conduct, tore the petition without reading it, and turned haughtily away from those who had presented it, deigning no other reply to their suit.[2] It is not often that a trait of ungraciousness can be detected in the personal conduct of this Princess; but her temper, usually so sweet, was not exempt from the infirmities of frail humanity; and if she occasionally forgot her habitual self-control, by yielding to a temporary burst of passion, or manifestation of disdain, it must be allowed she had enough to try her.

The proceedings of the royal pair in regard to the ceremonial observances of their religion gave great offence, and excited uneasiness among zealous Protestants at this season. Darnley and his father, with the Earl of Atholl and some others, were regular attendants at the mass, and on Candlemas day followed in the procession with three hundred men, carrying their lighted tapers. Darnley swore withal "that he would have a mass again in St Giles's Church ere long." "Upon Saturday," writes Randolph, "he sent for the Lords Fleming, Livingstone, and Lindsay, and asked them whether

[1] Randolph to Throckmorton, Feb. 7, 1565-6—Advocates' Library, inedited.

[2] Ibid.

they would be content to go to mass with him, which they refusing, he gave them all very evil words."[1] Mary essayed the power of her persuasive eloquence on the same nobles and her two favourite ministers, Huntley and Bothwell; but they all refused, Bothwell more stoutly than any one,[2] which she took much amiss from him. "The Queen," continues Randolph, "useth speech to some others she useth to take by the hand, and offereth to lead them with her to mass, which things the Earls of Bothwell and Huntley both refuse to do."[3] And to this statement Bedford adds: "The Lord Darnley sometime would shut up the noblemen in chambers, thereby to bring them to hear mass; but such kind of persuasions take no place with them."[4] In another letter, Randolph says: "It is told me for certain that she hath got divers noblemen's hands and others, to maintain her against the Protestants, if she attempt to have a law this Parliament for liberty of conscience. Her account of friends in England was never so great; and lately at a banquet, beholding the Queen my mistress's picture, she said 'there was no other Queen of England but herself.' This Court so divided, that we look daily when things will grow to a new mischief; and assuredly, if now the Lords were in Scotland, with small support, I believe they should find some that would stick better unto them."[5] Our worthy ambassador here alludes to Moray and his outlawed associates, whom Queen Elizabeth, Mauvissière, Paul de Foix, Melville, and all the members of the English faction, had so perseveringly urged Queen Mary to pardon. It must be acknowledged that Randolph's letters justify Mary for refusing to recall home to her realm those who were prepared to abuse her grace by entering into fresh plots against her. Scots who transferred their duty to a foreign sovereign were better out of Scotland. Morton, Mary's Lord-Chancellor, their secret confederate, was acting the while the

[1] Randolph to Throckmorton, Feb. 7, 1565-6—Advocates' Library, inedited.
[2] Randolph to Cecil, Feb. 8, 1566-7—State Paper Office MS.
[3] Ibid., Feb. 14. [4] Ibid.
[5] Randolph to Throckmorton—Advocates' Library, Edinburgh.

part of the cat in the fable, by repeating to her Majesty all Darnley's follies, and warning her of his unfitness to be intrusted with more power to do mischief than he already possessed; while, on the other hand, he excited the ambition and piqued the pride of the boy-husband into asserting his marital superiority, by demanding the executive authority of the Crown; finally, he drew him to a private meeting in Lord Ruthven's sick-chamber,[1] with Lindsay and others of the conspirators, where, after blaming him "for the credit enjoyed by David Riccio, to which," they said, "his own partial favour had in a great measure contributed," and that "this was now turned against himself, who had less weight in the government than that fellow," they succeeded in entangling him in a treasonable correspondence with the banished Lords, and inducing him to recall, without his consort's sanction, those very men whom he had objected to her pardoning when she had been disposed to do so. Randolph, the ready go-between in these intrigues, went to Berwick to confer with Bedford, and to meet the French ambassador, and bespeak his good offices for the restoration of Moray and the other instruments of mischief. Rambouillet gave Randolph fair words, but acted in that matter according to the instructions of his own Court.

Rambouillet, accompanied by Monsieur de Clermont and six-and-thirty French gentlemen, arrived in Edinburgh at two o'clock on the 4th of February. He spoke that night to their Majesties, by whom he was received with great respect; but the interview being strictly private, great curiosity was excited to learn the subject of the conference. He was lodged in Holyrood, near the gate of the Court, and his expenses defrayed by the Queen. He had his state reception the next day at two o'clock, after the Queen's dinner, the chief part of her nobility being present. She and her consort conversed with him apart, but what they said was not audible to the Court circle.[2]

These mysterious communications between the French envoys and their Majesties were not in favour of the rebel

[1] Spottiswood's History of the Church of Scotland.
[2] Randolph to Throckmorton, Feb. 7—Advocates' Library, inedited.

Lords, but earnest dissuasions against their recall; for it was represented to Mary, who, as usual, when her anger cooled, was disposed to deal leniently with her foes, that their absence would be a favourable moment for her obtaining the relief she desired for those of her own persuasion in regard to their worship, and that her contemplated act for liberty of conscience would never pass if Moray and his faction were allowed to resume their senatorial functions as Peers of Parliament. M. Villemonte, one of the mission, was especially accredited by Cardinal de Lorraine to urge the Queen very strongly on these points; and she, loth to offend her uncle, who had strong worldly wisdom in favour of his arguments, consented that the outlawed peers should all be summoned to answer for their treasons on the 12th of March, the Parliament being convened to meet on the 7th of that month. [1]

The following passage in a letter from Randolph to Cecil, dated February 8th, has deceived those writers who have only taken a superficial view of the subject, into the idea that Mary Stuart was a party to the League. "There was," says he, "a bond lately devised, in which the late Pope, the Emperor, the King of Spain, the Duke of Savoy, with divers princes of Italy, and the Queen-mother (Catharine de Medicis), suspected to be of the same confederacy, agreed to maintain Papistry throughout Christendom. This bond was sent out of France by Thornton, and is subscribed by this Queen, the copy thereof remaining with her, and the principal to be returned very shortly, as I hear, by Mr Stephen Wilson, a fit minister for such devilish devices. If the copy hereof can be gotten, it shall be sent as conveniently I may." [2]

Though nothing can be more positive than this statement of Randolph, it is disproved by himself in a subsequent letter, wherein, after mentioning the alleged agreement, as if for the first time, he says, "It is come to this Queen's hand, but *not yet confirmed*," [3] and this it certainly never was by

[1] Memoirs of Sir James Melville.
[2] Randolph to Cecil, Feb. 8—Stevenson's Illustrations.
[3] Randolph to Cecil, Feb. 14, 1566—Stevenson's Illustrations.

Mary Stuart, whose name is not so much as mentioned in connection with the League, by either of the contemporary historians who have entered most fully into the details of that pact, Strada and the elder d'Aubigné—the first the great Protestant authority, the latter a Jesuit, perfectly informed on the subject, and who would have considered it no blame;[1] and although it is generally supposed that the atrocious project of crushing the Reformation by an alliance of the Roman Catholic Sovereigns of Europe, for the extirpation of heresy, was first started at the meeting between the royal families of France and Spain, at Bayonne, in the autumn of 1565, there is not the slightest documentary proof that anything in the form of a regular agreement was subscribed by the parties till February 14, 1577, when the Great League was concluded at Peronne; consequently, nothing of the kind was done, or could have been done, by Mary Stuart, as erroneously affirmed by several modern historians.[2] No imputation has been more injurious to the memory of Mary than this charge; but, like many of the accusations that have been brought against her, a little research serves to clear away the calumny.

The ceremonial of the investiture of her consort as a Knight Companion of the Royal French Order of St Michael, was performed in the presence of Queen Mary and her Court, with great pomp, by Monsieur de Rambouillet and his noble assistants, on Sunday, February 10. The herald's fee on that occasion was Darnley's robe of crimson satin, guarded with black satin and black velvet, with gold aglets, and a chain worth 200 crowns of the sun. The Queen presented Rambouillet, as a token of her esteem, and in

[1] See also Anquetel, another of the historians of the League, and Lingard, Hist. of Elizabeth's Reign, in which he positively denies that Mary Stuart signed the treaty of the League, or any of its preliminary articles. See also Carruthers, a Roman Catholic historian of Mary, in his History of Scotland.

[2] Robertson, Gilbert Stuart, Tytler, and Mignet, not one of whom had seen Randolph's second letter contradicting the too hasty assertion in his first. Sir James Melville has, indeed, a confused sentence which appears to contain an implication of the kind, but this is an inference contradicted by positive evidence; and assuredly neither Knox nor Buchanan would have been silent if there had even been cause for suspecting Mary of so great a violation of her duty to her Protestant subjects.

acknowledgment of the honour conferred on her consort, a silver basin and ewer, two cups with covers, a salt, and a large trencher, with a spoon, all double gilt, and two horses. Randolph, with malicious satisfaction, informs Leicester, who had addressed a reproof to him for the libellous and unbecoming language in which he had of late written of Queen Mary, "that one of these horses was the black gelding his lordship had formerly presented to her Majesty."[1] Leicester was at this juncture assuming the tone of a partisan of Mary, to manifest his resentment of the matrimonial treaty then proceeding between Elizabeth and the Archduke Charles.

Urgent persuasives were used by Mary and Darnley to induce the nobles to accompany them and the ambassador to the Chapel-royal, on the day of Darnley's investiture; but the most part declined doing so, and went to the sermon. The same evening a banquet was made to the ambassador and his suite by their Majesties "in the old Chapel of Holyrood, which was reapparelled with fine tapestry and dressed magnificently."[2] The entertainment closed with a mask. Next day their Majestics banqueted the ambassade again, and in the evening there was masking and mumming, in which both the King and Queen took part. The Queen and her ladies, clad in quaint array, "presented every one of them to the ambassador and the gentlemen of his train, a whingar, bravely and most artificially made, and embroidered with gold."[3] On the Tuesday the Lords of the Council gave his Excellency and his company a supper, which was succeeded by a costly mask, performed by the Queen, her husband, David Riccio, and seven others, in rich attire.[4] The death of the unfortunate Italian was even then determined by the perfidious boy who condescended to unite with him as a playfellow in these gay pastimes of the Court. What masking it was! The festivities closed on the 13th with a banquet at Edinburgh Castle, given by the Earl of Mar,

[1] Randolph to Leicester, Feb. 14—Fitch's MSS., Ipswich.
[2] Diurnal of Occurrents. [3] Ibid.
[4] Randolph to Leicester—Fitch's MSS.

at the unusually late dinner-hour of two o'clock. Queen Mary and her consort honoured the entertainment with their presence, out of respect for the company, and the cheer was great. The artillery fired a royal salute when their Majesties left the Castle, to return to the Abbey. They gave an entertainment themselves in the evening, as a farewell compliment to the departing ambassade.

In the self-same letter which records the round of banquets, masks, and princely pleasures the royal pair had just enjoyed in the seemly unity of conjugal companionship, the English Mephistopheles, Randolph, exultingly unfolds to Leicester the items of the black budget, prepared with his approval, against the meeting of the Scottish Parliament, by the unscrupulous coalition of traitors who were secretly allied with their Sovereign's husband and his father in a dastardly bond for murder, premeditated in cold blood, and intended to be perpetrated in the presence of their Queen—a sensitive, excitable young woman, in an advanced stage of pregnancy with her first child, the heir-presumptive of three realms; and the crime was to be justified, as such deeds generally are, by slander. "I know now for certain," writes he, "that this Queen repenteth her marriage—that she hateth him and all his kin. I know that he knoweth himself that he hath a partner in play and game with him. I know that there are practices in hand, contrived between the father and the son, to come by the crown against her will. I know that if it take effect which is intended, David, with the consent of the King, shall have his throat cut within these ten days. Many things *grieveousser*, and worse than these, are brought to my ears, yea, of things *intended against her own person*, which, because I think better to keep secret than write to Mr Secretary, I speak not of them, but now to your lordship."[1] By one of the secret articles of the atrocious pact to which our worthy ambassador alludes, the life-long imprisonment of Mary was agreed, and her death, in case of her attempting to resist the transfer of the whole power of the Crown to the ungrateful consort she had associated in her regality; and to this wrong Cecil, Bedford, and Elizabeth tacitly

[1] Randolph to Leicester—Fitch's MSS.

consented. In reference to his former eulogiums on Mary, Randolph goes on to say: "So long as I found her Grace of other nature, mind, and disposition than she now is, your lordship can witness how ready I was to honour her and to set forth her praises. Now that these conditions are changed, why should not I alter my manner of writing, though not to the like extremity or high degree of malice she useth in her speech and doings?" Then, in deprecation of the political championship Leicester appeared disposed to undertake in favour of Mary's claims on the English succession, Randolph adds, "If ever your lordship give your consent that either she or her husband succeed to our Sovereign, therein you shall do against God and your country, and bring in as great a plague unto our nation as can come out of hell." To Throckmorton, who had written to reprove him for his coarse and slanderous language of Mary, Randolph writes of her in less violent but no less inimical terms. "Her words of late," he says, "were never fairer, her countenance sweeter, her usage towards those she intendeth to abuse more gentle, more humane, and pleasanter, than within these few days it hath been; whereby she thinketh not only to assuage the just ire and indignation conceived against her here among her own subjects, but also to allure unto her the hearts of other in foreign countries, that are yet in suspense what they may judge of her." The estimation in which Mary was held on the Continent, especially in France, where she was personally known, stood too high to require the degrading arts of dissimulation to enhance it. Randolph, with a bitter allusion to her marriage with Darnley as the cause of her dissension with Moray and the other banished Lords, observes, "Now that she hath matched herself, against my mistress's will, with as errant a Papist that of many years was hatched in our country, and driven out of her own the noblest and worthiest it ever yet bore; and here, to the great grief of the godly, establisheth her idolatrous mass." This, be it remembered, was not tolerated anywhere beyond the precincts of the Chapel-royal; and hard it was if Mary might not herself enjoy that freedom of worship of which she had

never attempted to deprive any one, save those of her own religion, when rendered the unwilling instrument of enforcing the Parliamentary statutes of 1560 against the solemnisation of the rites of the Church of Rome.

A startling light is thrown, by a careful collation of the above letters of Randolph to Leicester and Throckmorton, on the agency, as well as the incentives, employed in the successive Edinburgh assassinations of Mary Stuart's faithful and incorruptible minister, David Riccio, in March 1566, and that of her husband in February 1567, which led to the deposition of that unfortunate Princess, and the transfer of the government of Scotland to the sworn creatures of the English Sovereign: a great but diabolical stroke of policy. The cool revelation of our unscrupulous ambassador, that the faithful minister, who would not barter his royal mistress's interests for English gold, "would have his throat cut within ten days," is sufficient proof of his iniquitous coalition in the murderous confederacy against the first victim of the English Cabinet. His hostile expressions regarding Mary's husband, with whom he was at that very moment enleagued in the secret intrigues for obtaining the signatures of Moray and the banished Lords to the bond for the murder of Riccio, are no less worthy of observation, together with his earnest deprecation of Mary and her husband ever succeeding to the throne of England, and the emphatic desire he expresses to Throckmorton that "something may be done to preclude the possibility of such a contingency."[1] Apprehension of the re-establishment of Romanism in England is the motive he alleges for his objections, and that evil may be done for a good purpose. "If we have felt," he says, "or if we have been partakers of the miseries of the like time, the like state, and the like government, why do we not look to ourselves, and provide for our own safety, before we wholly give over our rights, our possessions, and all that we have? For if you find, either in this Queen and her husband, but that which you have experimented and felt in the last of her name that reigned in England, neither is there judgment in those here that

[1] Randolph to Throckmorton, Feb. 10.

know her best, nor wisdom in any man to perceive whereunto she tendeth."[1] Such was the logic whereby this subtle diplomatist first excited and then worked on the natural fears of better men than either himself, Leicester, or Throckmorton, to wink at, if not to sanction, the systematic train of political villany to which David Riccio, Henry Stuart, and Mary Stuart, were the successive victims. After the consummation of these astute schemes of wickedness—when Riccio and Darnley were festering in their untimely graves, and the more pitiable survivor, Mary Stuart, languishing in her damp noisome prison-room in Tutbury Castle, her infant son set up as a puppet King, to colour the usurpation of the murderers of his father and her defamers, and her realm convulsed with civil strife—"then," observes Sir James Melville, "as Nero stood upon a high part of Rome to see the town burning, which he had caused set on fire, so Master Randolph delighted to see such fire kindled in Scotland; and by his writings to some in the Court of England, glorified himself to have brought it to pass in such sort that it could not be easily *slokened* (slaked) again; which, when it came to the knowledge of Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, he wrote in Scotland to my brother and me, and advertised us how we were handled, detesting both Master Cecil as director and Master Randolph as executor. As I have said, all the honest men in England were sorry at it, of the which number there are as many within that country as in any other so mickle bounds in Europe."[2]

The first step towards the realisation of objects as yet but dimly foreshadowed in the distance, had been to excite discord between the royal pair, who, while united, had proved too formidable for rebels and rivals. As yet their differences had not exceeded the bounds of lovers' quarrels, and the moment was not remote when the holy feelings of paternity might be expected to reconcile all petty jars, and bind anew the links of conjugal affection. To blight this prospect, and produce irreconcilable estrangement between

[1] Randolph to Throckmorton, Feb. 10—Advocates' Library, Edinburgh.
[2] Sir James Melville's Memoirs, p. 234.

Mary and her husband, every exertion was made; nor were there lacking meet instruments for this purpose among the Douglas lineage, Darnley's maternal kindred. Pre-eminent among these in talents as in craft stood the Earl of Morton, a secret-service man of England, and the political ally of Moray, to whose political patronage he owed the office of Lord-Chancellor.[1] Nurtured in treason, as the son of the notorious Sir George Douglas, and treasuring a debt of hereditary vengeance against the daughter of James V., in remembrance of the vindictive dealings of that monarch against his family, he rendered himself a ready agent for exciting the discontent of his youthful cousin Darnley, by insinuating his compassion for the degrading position occupied by a puppet King in tutelage to his own wife, observing "that it was a thing contrary to nature that the hen should crow before the cock, and against the law of God that a man should be subject to his wife—the man being the image of God, and the woman the image of man." Nor were Knox's amiable arguments against the "monstrous regiment of women" forgotten. Morton, finding these sentiments suited well the arrogant temperament of Darnley, proceeded to suggest "the propriety of his emancipating himself from womanly control, by forcing the Queen to resign the government into his hands," and promised "to render him effectual assistance in any undertaking for that object"—assuring him, at the same time, "that David Riccio counselled the Queen to keep him without revenue, and in subjection to herself, and that he would never obtain the matrimonial crown of Scotland, and the respect and obedience of the Queen and her subjects, as long as that wily foreigner was in existence."[2] Morton's especial hatred to Riccio had been thus provoked. Lethington, jealous of Riccio having superseded him in his duty of Secretary of State, persuaded him, in the hope of thus accomplishing his ruin, to seek the office of Lord-Chancellor, "which," said he, "is in Morton's hands—a man nowise fit for the place,

[1] Blackwood's Life of Mary. Lives of the Douglases, by Hume of Godscroft.

[2] Adam Blackwood's Life of Queen Mary.

being both unlettered and unskilful. Do but deal with the Queen to discountenance Morton as a secret favourer of Moray, and with the King, to insist on his right to the Earldom of Angus, and Morton will be glad to demit to you his place of Chancellor as the price of your favour: but this place, being the chief office in the realm, can only be possessed by a Scottish nobleman; you must therefore be naturalised as a free denizen, and have the title of an Earl, which the Queen can confer on you herself."[1] Riccio, beguiled by this insidious advice, fell into the snare; "the bait" which, Randolph says, "was laid for him."

The Castle of Tantallon had been summoned and delivered into the King's hands several months before, and now he was entered heir to his grandfather, Archibald Earl of Angus. Morton easily traced these inimical proceedings to David Riccio's counsels, and therefore took no ordinary pains to accomplish his death. In this he was ably seconded by Lord Ruthven, the husband of the late Earl of Angus's daughter by his first marriage, Lady Janet Douglas, who pretended a better title to the Angus heritage than Darnley's mother; and above all by her illegitimate brother George Douglas, called the Postulate, having been, like Moray, and many others born under the like circumstances, bred to the Church, and designed for some of the great benefices in the gift of his licentious father, of which Aberbrothock was one. George the Postulate left his priestly profession, his habit, and his vows, but kept his ecclesiastical titles and benefices. A great intimacy grew between him and Darnley, who always called him uncle; and even the Queen, after her marriage, out of respect to her husband, complimented both George the Postulate and Lord Ruthven with that endearing title. In return, they both laboured to alienate her husband's affection from her, and to persuade him that David Riccio possessed greater influence over her mind than himself. This incendiary system was commenced by George the Postulate within the third month after Mary's marriage, at which period the first altercations between the royal pair may be dated. While the Court

[1] Lives of the Douglases, by Hume of Godscroft.

was either at Glasgow or Dumfries, Darnley and Riccio, who were still, to outward appearance, on very intimate terms, paid George the Postulate a visit at his castle of Todsholes, at Dunsyre in Lanarkshire, and all three went in a small boat to fish on the dark deep waters of the Craneloch, situated in the midst of a barren heath, far remote from the haunts of men, and about a mile in circumference. When they were in the centre of this dismal tarn, which abounds in perch and pike, and all engaged in their sport, Riccio's back being turned to the other two, George the Postulate made signs to Darnley, intimating that they could toss the little Italian into the deep water, where he would have perished mysteriously without either of them being called to account for it.[1]

What a subject for a painter!—the wild desolate scene, and the passions of the actors in that mute controversy for murder; the sinister glance and significant attitude of the sometime priest, George Douglas; the surprise and indignant recoil of the princely gallant, contrasted with the careless security of the little misshapen Secretary, pleased with his holiday from diplomatic toils, and exerting all his dexterity to escape the raillery of companions better skilled in piscatory science than himself, by drawing safely into the boat his struggling prize—some giant pike perchance—and quite unconscious of the fact that his own life hangs on a frailer thread than the finely-twisted line to which his scaly captive is suspended. Darnley revolted from the fell suggestion of becoming an accomplice in a cowardly assassination with the natural feelings of his ingenuous period of life, and hastily interposed to prevent the perpetration of the crime. The moral deterioration which evil company and intemperance produce had not then taken place. But when he acquired, among the dissolute society and low revels he frequented, the national vice of drinking, the fatal spirit-cup was to his naturally excitable temperament like pouring fire into his veins, and infusing temporary frenzy through his system. Mary witnessed with bitter anguish the effects

[1] This curious anecdote is edited by R. Chambers, Esq., from a MS. Memoir of the family of Dalgleish, in his valuable Life of James I.

of this pernicious habit, which not only destroyed domestic comfort in their private hours of conjugal companionship, but degraded him in the eyes of the nobles, and rendered him an object of contempt to persons even of inferior degree. Any attempt on her part to restrain him from disgracing himself by a public exposure of his folly, was fiercely resented by the petulant boy-husband. The following particulars of his misconduct are communicated to the English Secretary, Cecil, by Sir William Drury in a letter from Berwick:—

"Monsieur de la Roi Paussey and his brother arrived here yesterday: he is sick, my Lord Darnley having made him drink too much aqua composita. All people say Darnley is too much addicted to drinking. 'Tis certainly reported there was some jar betwixt the Queen and him at an entertainment in a merchant's house in Edinburgh, she only dissuading him from drinking too much himself and enticing others, in both which he proceeded and gave her such words that she left the place with tears, which they who know their proceedings say are not strange to be seen."[1]

The wife of an Edinburgh burgess would scarce have brooked such treatment; what then must have been the feelings of Scotland's Queen and loveliest woman, when exposed to public insults from the ungrateful springald whom she had fondly associated in her regality. "His government," continues our authority, "is very much blamed, for he is thought to be wilful and haughty, and some say vicious, whereof too many were witnesses the other day at Inchkeith, with the Lord Robert Fleming, and suchlike grave personages." Some very disgraceful story connected with Darnley's exploits on that occasion was in circulation, and, according to Drury, improper to be committed to paper.[2] The royal rose of Scotland had indeed wasted her sweetness and her charms on a bosom unworthy of the envied lot of winning and wearing a prize, for which the mightiest and most illustrious princes of Europe had contended in vain.

[1] February 16, 1565-6. Keith, 329.

[2] Ibid.

During the eventful month of February 1566, a collision took place between Queen Mary and the perfidious English minister Randolph, whose correspondence with her rebels, and intrigues to excite disaffection among all degrees of her subjects, had become notorious. It may be remembered that, in the commencement of the insurrectionary movement of Moray and his faction, in the preceding August, Randolph had intrusted John Johnstone, a confidential agent of Moray, with the English subsidy, in three sealed bags, each containing three thousand crowns, to carry to St Andrews, and deliver to Lady Moray—Moray acting with his usual selfish caution in not appearing personally in the transaction as the recipient of the English gold. His wife stood in the gap, and made herself responsible for the misdemeanour, by sending her card back to Randolph, in token that the money had been delivered to her, and was, in consequence, expelled from her palatial abode, and compelled to take refuge with her English friends at Berwick.[1] James Johnstone, the agent in conveying the bribe, fled also; but after six months' absence he obtained his pardon, by revealing the full particulars of the transaction. Mary, with her characteristic impetuosity, summoned Randolph before her Council, and upbraided him with the violation of his ambassadorial duties, by fomenting discord in her realm, and, in direct opposition to the amicable professions of the Queen his mistress, supplying her rebellious subjects with funds to levy war against her. Randolph stoutly denied the imputation; but Mary told him she could show him that she spake from no light report, and therewith ordered Johnstone to be introduced. This witness substantiated his deposition with so many irrefragable proofs that even Randolph was silenced. Unsupported by the presence of her husband, now closely enleagued with that perfidious English statesman and his Scotch confederates in a guilty alliance against her person and authority, Mary sat long in earnest deliberation with her Council on the proper course

[1] Papers discovered in the Earl of Leven's charter-chest, printed in the Maitland Club Miscellany, vol. iii. part 1.

to pursue, and finally resolved to order Randolph to be conducted, under a guard, over the boundary of the realm, as a person convicted of abusing the privileges and violating the duties of his sacred office.[1] Nor did she hesitate to pass this sentence on him in his own presence, with passionate reproaches for his treacherous practices against her. She also directed her ambassador, Sir Robert Melville, to address a formal complaint of his proceedings to Queen Elizabeth, and ordered "that the Earl of Leicester, whose man," she contemptuously observes, "he is, should be acquainted with his doings."[2] How trifling were these of which she could convict him, in comparison with the complicated train of villanies he had practised against her from her harmless infancy upwards! Mary had unmasked, but not disarmed, the plotting foeman who had sown the hydra teeth of discord in her realm; to take his life was neither in her power nor according to the feminine spirit that ruled her actions. Berwick, where he took up his abode, to watch the explosion of the mine he had assisted to prepare, was a convenient station for conducting his share of the business, the correspondence, and preliminary arrangements between the traitors in Mary's household and those in exile at Newcastle, and obtaining the sanction of the leading members of the English Cabinet to the assassination of Mary's Secretary in her presence, and her deposition, under the pretext of conferring the crown of Scotland on her husband.[3]

The last gay doings in Holyrood ever to take place under the auspices of Mary Stuart commenced on the 24th of February, to celebrate the nuptials of the Earl of Bothwell with his fair kinswoman, the Lady Jane Gordon, sister of the Earl of Huntley. As the lady was a member of the Church of Rome, the Queen desired that the marriage might be performed in her Chapel-royal, with the mass, and all the solemnities with which that religion renders

[1] Papers discovered in the Earl of Leven's charter-chest, printed in the Maitland Club Miscellany, vol. iii. part 1. [2] Ibid.
[3] See Scotch Correspondence in State Paper Office MSS., 1565–6.

wedlock an indissoluble tie, preventing either husband or wife from entering into a second matrimony during the life of the other. Could even the most prejudiced of Mary's enemies, Knox, who records this fact,[1] believe that if she were cherishing improper sentiments for Bothwell she would have desired for him to marry another woman, and under that form which she herself esteemed obligatory until death should dissolve the plight? One of the leading features in the forged letters and sonnets pretended to have been addressed by Mary to him, is jealousy of Bothwell's wife. But how is this reconcilable with the active part taken by her in promoting his marriage with a lady of the highest rank and most powerful connections, a member of her own Church withal?[2]

Bothwell would neither gratify his Roman Catholic bride, nor oblige Queen Mary, by allowing his nuptials to be solemnised according to the ancient form,[3] his antipathy to the rites of the Church of Rome being no less determined than that of his feudal vassal Knox. Their Majesties, nevertheless, united in honouring the bridal of this powerful Border chief with signal tokens of respect; for Mary regarded him as a faithful servant of the Crown, who had resisted the bribes of England, and Darnley, knowing that he had all the military force of the realm under his command, saw the expediency of propitiating him as a political power. So there was royal cheer in Holyrood at Bothwell's wedding with bonny Lady Jane Gordon, the sister of Mary's faithful counsellor, the Earl of Huntley; and Mary herself presided over the splendid entertainments that took place in consequence. "The King and Queen," says Lindsay of Pitscottie, "made the banquet at Holyrood the first day, and the feasting continued five days, with jousting and tournaments;" and it is further recorded, that five knights of Fife were made on this occasion. The idea that the Queen was enamoured of the rough ungraceful bridegroom

[1] Hist. Ref. Scot., vol. ii. p. 520.
[2] Keith's Appendix, p. 141.
[3] Knox, Hist. Ref. Scot. Chalmers.

would certainly have been regarded, at that time, as something too absurd for even party malignity to assert. Why he should have become more attractive to her as a married man than he had been as a bachelor, it would require much ingenuity to explain; it certainly was not for his conjugal virtues, as he proved a faithless unkind husband to a very amiable and beautiful wife, whom he neglected for her own servants.

MARY STUART

CHAPTER XXI.

SUMMARY

Real objects of conspiracy against the Queen and David Riccio—Darnley's jealousy and treachery to the Queen—His secret league with Moray—Queen and Darnley go to Seton House—Queen warned—Her incredulity—Returns to Holyrood to open Parliament—Designs to present her consort to the Three Estates—He refuses to accompany her, unless to open Parliament himself—Mary goes without him—Darnley plays at tennis with David Riccio—Advised to have him murdered then—Refuses, desiring it to be done in the Queen's presence—Preliminary arrangements for the murder—Armed assassins under Morton placed in Holyrood—Darnley admits them through his private entrance to the Queen's bedroom—The Queen at supper with her sister, brother, and others, in her cabinet—Darnley's perfidious caresses to the Queen—Queen alarmed by Ruthven's ferocity—Entrance of assassins—Queen tries to preserve David Riccio's life—He is stabbed in her presence—Her own life twice attempted—Her courageous conduct—David Riccio slain—Bothwell rallies the Queen's servants for her rescue—Driven back by Morton—Brutality of Ruthven to the Queen—She reproaches Darnley—His rejoinders—Insolence of Ruthven—The Lord Provost and loyal citizens come to Queen's aid—She is not allowed to speak to them—Brutal threats of the conspirators to the Queen—Her personal distress and captivity—Darnley discharges Parliament—Sends to comfort the Queen—His servants not allowed to see her—He goes to her himself—Her misery—Asks to have her ladies come to her—Objections of the conspirators—Darnley sends the ladies—Their fidelity to their royal mistress—Projects for her escape—She is visited by the Earl of Morton—Required to give the crown-matrimonial to her husband—Her reply.

In the midst of the fêtes and public entertainments given by Mary and Darnley at Holyrood Abbey in honour of the Earl of Bothwell's nuptials, the conspiracy for depriving Mary of her regal authority was actively proceeding. The history of that conspiracy has been little investigated by

those who, misled by the libels of Buchanan and the narrative of the assassins, imagine Darnley's absurd jealousy of David Riccio to have been the exciting cause; and the assassination of that defenceless foreigner the principal object of a league, which included not only the exiled Scotch Lords and their confederates at home, but the leading members of the English Cabinet, the English Sovereign herself, and her authorities on the Border. Elizabeth would have cared nothing for the conjugal wrongs, had such existed, of her contumacious subject, in a marriage contracted by him in defiance of her express prohibition; but it suited well her astute policy to allow her ministers and secret-service men to tamper with his ambition and his folly, in order to render him the instrument of destroying the wife of his bosom, and those hopes of a successor which had strengthened Mary Stuart's government in Scotland, and rendered her party in England too formidable to be contemplated without uneasiness.[1] Elizabeth had uncourteously refused to treat Darnley as the King-consort of Scotland, but through her emissaries she gave him every reason to expect support from her, in case he could be induced to make a bold attempt to wrest the regal authority from his wife. So far was the murder of Riccio from being the original object of this confederacy, that he was actually wooed by Darnley, in the first instance, to become a party to it; and if he could have betrayed the cause of his royal benefactress, he would have reaped any reward he might have pleased to demand; for being the channel through whom all Mary's private foreign-correspondence was carried on, he could, doubtless, by his revelations, have furnished some more feasible pretexts for her deposition and judicial murder. But Riccio refused to play the Judas, and considered it his duty, moreover, to warn the Queen that some iniquitous intrigue was in agitation against her, to which her husband, with his father and some of the confederates of the banished Lords, were parties. Mary, at first, knew not how to credit this sad intimation; but having ascertained that a secret

[1] See the letters of Bedford and Randolph to Cecil and Elizabeth, in February and March 1566—State Paper Office.

meeting of the suspected persons was to take place one evening in her husband's chamber, she entered unexpectedly, and surprised them together. The guilty conclave exhibited signs of confusion and dismay; but Darnley assumed an imperious tone of conjugal authority, gave her ungentle words, accused her of listening to spies and tale-bearers, and of watching him, and intruding her company when not desired by him.[1] Mary proudly withdrew, and entered her husband's apartments no more. Darnley's personal vanity was piqued by this assumption of coldness and disdain on the part of the royal beauty; and although it had been caused by his own unkindness, he put on the airs of an injured person, complained resentfully of her "coying him," and injuriously pretended to believe her personal estrangement was caused by preference to another.[2]

The only man with whom the Queen was much in private was David Riccio, and this the nature of his office rendered necessary; while the defects of his person were such as almost to defy scandal itself to insinuate that she, who was esteemed the most beautiful Princess in the world, could prefer him to the husband of her choice—a Prince so eminently distinguished by nature with external graces of form, features, and complexion, and who

[1] Adam Blackwood's Life of Queen Mary—Maitland Club edition. Buchanan records the circumstance of Mary's surprising the confederates in Darnley's chamber.

[2] The following brief statement, from the pen of Sir James Melville, sufficiently explains what the motives of some of the leading actors in the tragedy were, and that the base calumny about the Queen's affection for Riccio was a mere political fiction, got up for the purpose of defending the assassination: "The Earl of Morton and his defenders feared a resolution that was alleged to be made at the said Parliament to bring back to the Crown divers great *dispositions* [grants] given out during the Queen's minority, and some benefices that were taken by noblemen, at their own hands, during the civil wars, under pretext of religion. This, and other particularities, moved them to consult together how to get the Parliament stayed, and to make a change in Court. The Earl of Morton had a crafty head, and had a cousin called George Douglas the Postulate, son natural to the Earl of Angus, who was also father to Dame Margaret Douglas, Countess of Lennox, the King's mother. The said George was continually about the King, as his mother's brother, and put in his head such suspicion against Seigneur David, that the King was won to give his consent over facily to the slaughter of Seigneur David, which the Lords of Morton, Ruthven, Lindsay, and others had devised, that way to be masters of the Court and to stay the Parliament."

excelled in riding, dancing, tilting, and all manly and courtly exercises.

The testimonies of David Riccio's ugliness and deformity are numerous. At the head of these stands Buchanan, who writes "that his face spoiled his ornaments and rich dress, and that the Queen could not amend the defects of his person." Another contemporary, author of "Le Livre de la Mort Marie Stuart," printed in 1587, declares he was "*disgracie de corps*," and of mature years, but great sagacity. The author of "Martire de Marie" says: "The credit he enjoyed with his mistress was not on account of any beauty he possessed, being an old man, and ugly, swarthy, and ill-favoured, but because of his great fidelity, wisdom, prudence, and many other excellent endowments." Connaeo declares that he was "old and deformed, but of spotless faith, and possessed of rare talents." Louis Guryon, *conseiller de finances* to the King of France, gives the most conclusive testimony of all, for he says, "I was well acquainted with David Riccio, from whom I received many civilities in that Court. He was in years, of dark hue, and very ill-favoured; but of a rare prudence, and very skilful in business."[1] But inasmuch as the doom of this faithful servant had been sealed from the hour he refused to join in the conspiracy against his royal benefactress, it was necessary to devise some plausible pretext for shedding his blood. The confidence reposed in him by the Queen rendered him, as a foreigner, very obnoxious to the national prejudices of the nobles, and his devotion to his unpopular religion made him an object of suspicion and ill-will to the people in general. It was industriously reported that he was a pensioner of the Pope, and intended to use his influence with the Queen for the overthrow of the Reformed Church; and this might possibly be true, yet it is certain that he had done nothing either to furnish matter for impeachment, or a criminal process, or there would have been no necessity for the lawless proceedings to which his enemies resorted, nor yet for the absurd calumnies whereby they sought to excuse their crime. The murder of David Riccio

[1] Note in Gilbert Stuart, citing a letter of Lord Elibank to Lord Hailes.

was, however, only intended as the opening move in the attack on the Queen, and in this it was expedient to obtain the co-operation of her besotted husband.

Meantime the Earl of Morton, who had first incited Darnley to enter into these treasonable intrigues against the Queen, suddenly forsook the meetings of the conspirators, and appeared disposed to abandon the league. Alarmed at his demeanour, the confederates sent Andrew Ker of Faudonside and Sir John Bellenden, the Justice-Clerk—that great law-officer being, to his eternal disgrace, a coadjutor in the treason—to inquire the cause of his alienation. Morton replied, "that it was because of the King's persisting in claiming the Earldom of Angus," and was, with some difficulty, persuaded to meet him in the Earl of Lennox's chamber.[1] A family treaty was entered into then and there, whereby Darnley and his father renounced once more, for themselves and Lady Lennox, all claims on that patrimony in favour of Morton's nephew and ward, the young Earl of Angus. This sacrifice having purchased the full co-operation of Morton in their enterprise, the bonds or secret articles were drawn between Darnley and the banished Lords, in which it was stipulated that Darnley should obtain their pardon and recall on condition "that they would procure for him the crown-matrimonial of Scotland, and that, in event of the Queen's death, he should be declared her rightful successor, and his father the next heir after himself;[2] and that the Lords would pursue, slay, and extirpate all who opposed this resolution."[3] Did Darnley never, while engaged in plotting with traitors and incendiaries to dethrone and calumniate his royal consort and benefactress, call to mind the oaths of allegiance he swore to her on the 15th of May at Stirling—oaths which were rendered more obligatory by the sacred laws of the code of chivalry, and the knighthood he on that day received from her hand? In one of the bonds executed in his name, it is stated "that the Queen's good and gentle nature was abused by some

[1] Hume of Godscroft—Lives of the Douglases, p. 289. Ibid
[3] See the copy of the bond in the Earl of Leven's papers, printed in the Maitland Miscellany.

wicked and ungodly persons, specially an Italian called David," declaring his intention, "with the aid of certain of his nobility, to seize and cut them off, and slay them wheresoever it happened;" and promising, "on the word of a Prince, to maintain and defend his assistants in the enterprise, even if carried into execution in the presence of the Queen."[1]

The cause of religion was, of course, brought prominently forward in the general and more public bond; yet what grimace was this for Darnley, the most violent and bigotted Roman Catholic in the realm, he who had done what Mary never attempted to do—inhibited John Knox from preaching, rated the Lords for not going with him to mass, tossed the Psalm-book into the fire, and swore he would have a mass in St Giles's—now pledging himself to keep the religion as it had been established by the Queen, that wise and tolerant Princess whom they were preparing, in return, to supersede in favour of so unworthy a successor. Small was their care for religion; but Darnley had guaranteed to them the possession of their unlawful acquisitions, the mammon of unrighteousness being their idol. "The King and his father subscribed the bond," says Knox, "for they durst not trust the King's word without his signet."[2] Lennox undertook the office of going to England, to assure Moray and the other outlaws there that they might return with safety. It must be remembered that the reason Mary had refused to treat with them, through the offered mediation of Mauvissière in the preceding September, was because they had conspired against her husband's life. Darnley and Lennox were now willing to pardon this, on condition of their assisting to dethrone Mary, and transfer the government of the realm to Darnley. Lennox, though a proscribed outlaw himself in England, was allowed to enter that realm and confer with Bedford and Randolph, his previous foes, and proceed to Newcastle without the slightest danger or inconvenience, for the English government was well aware of all that was going on; and Moray had pledged himself to obtain, through

[1] Tytler. Cott. Caligula, book ix. p. 212, endorsed by Randolph.

[2] Hist. Ref. Scot. This must refer to some bond of which no copy has been preserved, for there are no signatures of Lennox and his son attached to that signed by Moray.

his friend Cecil, the deliverance of Lady Lennox and Lord Charles Lennox from durance, with leave for them to join him and Darnley at Holyrood.

The murderous instrument entitled "Ane Bond, made by my Lord of Moray, and certain other noblemen with him, before the slaughter of Davie," is still in existence in the charter-chest of the Earl of Leven at Melville, having the autograph signatures of the six banished Scotch Lords, headed by the Earl of Moray, who signs himself James Stewart. It is dated at Newcastle, the 2d of March 1565-(6).[1] On Sunday the 3d of March began the general fasting at Edinburgh, which always drew a concourse of the most disaffected of the half-Judaised zealots of the west country into the metropolis. The pulpits sounded notes of alarm on the all-exciting subject of Popery, and the lessons were chosen from such passages of the Old Testament as might be most readily perverted to the anti-Christian purpose of warrants for slaughter and persecution.[2]

Meantime the Queen, attended by her personal train, her Privy Council, her principal ministers, and accompanied by her husband, retired to Seton House, to pass a brief interval of quiet before the meeting of Parliament. She was glad, doubtless, to escape from the irritation of hearing frequent reports of the proceedings of Knox and his brethren in the churches and public assemblies, their laudations of the rebel Lords, and inflammatory sermons, in which she was, as usual, compared to Jezebel, Sisera, and other notorious objects of divine wrath and vengeance.

Darnley, infinitely more impatient than Mary of such language and comparisons, took refuge with her at Seton from the penance of giving his presence to the preachings, well knowing that, if he remained in Edinburgh during the fast week, no less a test of his intention to support the true Evangile against Popery would have been required by the uncompromising party with whom he was now politically allied. Mary employed herself in choosing the Lords of the Articles, preparing her speech, and arranging with

[1] Printed in Maitland Miscellany.
[2] Tytler; Chalmers; Knox.

her Council the measures necessary to be adopted in the opening of the session; while her husband, whose part was to watch her proceedings, exchanged communications two or three times a-day with Ruthven and the other traitors in the Court who had not been permitted to accompany her to Seton. Some deliberations there were between Darnley and his confederates on the expediency of perpetrating the assassination of David, and the arrest of the Queen during the recess at Seton; but the proposition was negatived—first, because of the incorruptible fidelity of the Lord of the Castle to his royal mistress; and, secondly, because their intentions, though repeatedly hinted to the Queen of England and her ministers, had not been so fully made as to preclude the possibility of her turning round on them hereafter, and upbraiding them with their treacherous dealings, in the event of their project being defeated; for thus had she treated Moray and the Hamiltons, after their unsuccessful attempts against their Sovereign in the preceding autumn. Randolph, who was then at Berwick, acting, as he had long done, entirely as the agent and organ of communication between Mary's traitors and the English Sovereign, wrote to Elizabeth, on the 6th of March, to apprise her that "a matter of no small consequence in Scotland was intended," referring her for particulars to a letter addressed by himself, in conjunction with the Earl of Bedford, to Mr Secretary Cecil.[1] "No one except the Queen, Leicester, and Cecil himself," as the joint writers of the latter record of diplomatic villany state, "were to be informed of the great event now on the eve of being put in execution."[2] This, they describe, is to be done with the co-operation and in the presence of Mary's consort, which was necessary to give a colour to the scandalous imputations of injuries done

[1] Chalmers.

[2] State Paper Office MSS. Tytler's Hist. Scot., vol. vii. p. 24. Speaking of the rebel Lords, in a previous letter, Bedford says: "The Parliament draweth now near, whereat both their lands and goods shall be confiscate. It would do well that the commission were hastened, if it were but for their cause, to assure what good might be done for them, peradventure somewhat might be done for to drive off time and prolong *their* Parliament."—Bedford to Cecil, Feb. 14, 1566; Stevenson's Illustrations, p. 151.

to him by the victim of the murderous confederacy. Copies of the bonds entered into for the perpetration of the slaughter, and the subsequent treason of which that enterprise was only to be the first step, were enclosed—copies made, as expressly stated, by the hand of Randolph himself, from the originals, which he had seen![1] "To this determination of theirs," continues the equally honourable coadjutor in the confederacy, Bedford, "there are privy in Scotland these—Argyll, Morton, Boyd, Ruthven, and Lethington. In England these—Moray, Rothes, Grange, myself, and the writer hereof. If persuasions to cause the Queen to yield to these matters" (the resignation of her crown and high vocation to her worthless intemperate husband) "do no good, they purpose to proceed we *know not in what sort.*" After this emphatic hint of an intention against the fair Sovereign of Scotland, too black to be committed to paper, or even acknowledged by our cool pair of Englishmen—unworthy of the name!—they add: "These are the things which we thought and think to be of no small importance; and knowing them certainly intended and concluded upon, thought it our duties to utter the same to you, Mr Secretary, to make declaration thereof as shall seem best to your wisdom."

One word from Elizabeth, from Cecil, or Bedford, of disapproval to Moray, the master-mover of the plot at Newcastle, would have prevented its execution. But the blow was aimed at Mary Stuart, intended for her destruction and that of her unborn infant, and for the destruction of Darnley also, who, in the event of his consort's death, would have been torn limb from limb by the terrible justice of popular vengeance. Nay, would not the plausible Moray himself have assumed the character of the avenger of his royal sister, and trod his way, over the mangled corpses of her guilty but deluded husband and his unprincipled father, to the throne of Scotland—that throne so long the object of his ambition, but which he could only hope to fill as the creature of the English Sovereign?

Mary meantime was warned that some dark plot was in

[1] State Paper Office MS. Correspondence—Bedford and Randolph to Cecil, March 6, 1565–6.

agitation against her; but so secure was she of the affections of her people, that she fancied it was merely an attempt to intimidate her from the strong measures she contemplated against the exiled Lords. A French astrologer of the name of Damiot bade Riccio "beware of the bastard;" but Riccio, naturally supposing that Moray was the person intended, replied, "I will take good care he never sets foot again in Scotland." The oracle, however, bearing, like all such sayings, a double meaning, was fulfilled by the death-thrust dealt by George Douglas the Postulate, generally called the Bastard of Angus.[1] So little knowledge Riccio possessed of the characteristics of the people he was assisting the Queen to govern, that he sarcastically observed, "Parole, parole—nothing but words. The Scots will boast, but rarely perform their brags." This was in reply to one of his countrymen who told him he was unpopular, and advised him to return to his own country with the property he had amassed, about eleven thousand pounds Scots—little more than two thousand pounds sterling. Melville and Knox accuse him of receiving bribes from the nobles to further their suits with the Queen; and it is certain that Moray attempted to propitiate him in this way, by the present of a costly diamond. But his fidelity to his Sovereign was incorruptible; and it was his devotion to her service that provoked in a signal manner the malice of her foes.

The royal pair returned to Holyrood House about the 6th of March, the Estates of Scotland having been convened in the names of the King and Queen to meet their said Sovereign Lord and Lady at the Parliament Hall, in the Tolbooth, on the 7th of that month. Mary, in all good faith to her husband, desiring to take the earliest opportunity for legalising the dignity she had, by an unconstitutional act of royal authority, conferred upon him, had arranged for him to ride in state with her to the opening of the Parliament, which ceremonial it was her duty, as the crowned and anointed inheritrix of the realm, to perform as usual. She then proposed to introduce Darnley to the assembly as her consort, and to obtain his recognition from

[1] Knox; Spottiswood; Tytler.

the Estates of her realm as King and joint Sovereign of Scotland with herself, in order that he might take his place beside her on the throne, assist in sceptering the acts and all other functions of regality, and be regularly invested with those honours which at present he only received through her favour. The Queen well knew this form must be gone through before she could apply to her Parliament to assign a revenue to her impatient husband, and to supply the funds for the coronation of which he was childishly desirous; but Darnley's head was so completely turned by the intoxicating promises of the conspirators to invest him with the entire sovereignty of the realm, that he peremptorily refused to assume, even for a moment, an inferior position to his consort. He protested he would not be introduced by her to the Parliament; insisted that she should be conducted by him; and said, that "unless he were allowed to act as the Sovereign of Scotland, by opening the Parliament himself, he would in no wise condescend to give his presence to that ceremonial."[1] As it was impossible for Mary to accede to these unreasonable demands, he thought proper to put a public contempt upon her, by riding off to Leith,[2] with seven or eight of his intimate associates, to amuse himself there during the ceremonial. However inconveniently this perverse desertion might disarrange the programme of the state procession, the Queen persisted in her purpose of opening her Parliament in person that same day, and rode from the Abbey through the city to the Tolbooth, in wondrous gorgeous apparel.[3] The Earl of Huntley bore the crown before her, the Earl of Bothwell the sceptre, and the Earl of Crawford the sword of honour. Mary took her seat on her throne without the aid or presence of her truant boy-husband, and performed her part in all external forms as she had been accustomed to do during her widow reign, in companionless grandeur. But hard indeed must have been her task to suppress her

[1] Report on Scotch Affairs, addressed to Cosmo Duke of Tuscany—printed in Prince Labanoff's Appendix, vol. vii. Queen Mary's Letter to the Archbishop of Glasgow. Keith. Chalmers.
[2] Knox, Hist. Ref. Scot. Diurnal of Occurrents.
[3] Knox, Hist. Ref. Scot., vol. ii. p 520.

tears, and act and speak with the calm composure that beseemed the monarch, while the woman's heart was smarting so sorely from its recent wound.

Mary had with wifely patience and feminine delicacy refrained from complaining of her husband's neglect, his intemperate habits, his infidelities and frequent desertions; neither did she now complain, though nothing could be more insulting than this public mark of unkindness and disrespect. She exerted all her powers of self-control to conceal her distress, and gratified not the curiosity of vulgar minds by betraying the mortification it was impossible for her not to feel under the circumstances. The only business transacted that day, was declaring the names of the Lords of the Articles—seven spiritual and seven temporal Peers of Parliament. The Lords temporal were the King's father Matthew Earl of Lennox, his kinsman and especial friend, the Earl of Atholl, James Earl of Morton, the Earl Marischal (Moray's father-in-law), David Earl of Crawford, and the Earls of Huntley and Bothwell,[1] all of whom, except Lennox and Atholl, were Protestants. Three of the Lords spiritual were prelates of the old hierarchy; and undoubtedly one of the measures Mary proposed to carry in this Parliament was the restoration of votes and seats to the Bishops of her own persuasion—the mysterious "somewhat anent restoring the old religion" alluded to by her in her letter to the Archbishop of Glasgow.[2] The Earls of Huntley and Sutherland, who had been pardoned and restored to their titles by her letters-patent and royal proclamation in the preceding autumn, were now formally absolved by her, and restored to their honours and estates in the face of the Three Estates of Scotland, all previous acts against them repealed, and declared null and void.[3] The most important of the proceed-

[1] Diurnal of Occurrents.

[2] Keith. Mary's Letter to Archbishop of Glasgow—Goodall.

[3] Yet Buchanan, in the face of these public proceedings of the Queen in Parliament, hesitates not to affirm that she purchased the Earl of Huntley's consent to his sister's divorce from Bothwell in the following year, by restoring him to his forfeit titles and estates;—so perfectly shameless is this writer in his assertions; mistakes they could not be. What credit can be, or ought to be, given to the statements of so false a witness?

ings, however, which took place on that day, were the summonses issued for the Earl of Moray and the other Lords associated with him in the late insurrection, to appear before the Parliament on the 12th, to answer for their overt acts of treason. The interval of five days which intervened was amply sufficient to enable them to return, supposing they had been no farther off than Newcastle: they were probably much nearer.

Darnley had pledged himself to the confederates to do all that in him lay to prevent the meeting of the Parliament at the time appointed: he had endeavoured to perform his promise by absenting himself, thinking the Queen, sensitive as she was to public opinion, would rather prorogue the assembly than proceed thither without him. That she had done so, and gone through the business, as far as it went, successfully, proved that he was regarded as a person of no importance, but as a mere appendage to her greatness, and that his presence or absence was matter of indifference to her realm. It was this mortifying sense of the inferiority of his position, engendering the basest passion of which corrupt human nature is capable, envy, that incited Darnley to temporary madness against his wife—not personal jealousy of a creature so unfit to inspire a lady's love as Riccio. But the work of death was not to be confined to the foreign Secretary; a wholesale scene of slaughter was contemplated, including the whole of Mary's ministers who had shown themselves opposed to her virtual deposition by refusing to concur in granting the crown-matrimonial to her ungrateful husband. The intended victims were the Earls of Bothwell, Huntley, and Atholl, the Lords Fleming and Livingstone, and Sir James Balfour—the last was, for some unexplained reason, to be hanged at the Queen's chamber-door, and several of her most attached ladies were to be drowned. Mary herself, if she survived the horrors of the tragedy purposed to be acted in her presence, was either to be slain or imprisoned in Stirling Castle, till she consented to legalise her husband's usurpation.[1]

[1] Reports to Cardinal de Lorraine in Teulet, Pièces et Documens.

The depths of dissimulation with which so young and haughty a man as Darnley veiled these atrocious designs, appears even more remarkable than that he should have been so lost to conscience and to common-sense as to have entertained them. He even condescended, for the sake, it may be presumed, of averting suspicion of the deadly purpose he cherished against Riccio, to honour him with a challenge to play a game of tennis with him,[1] and was actually thus engaged with him for several hours on the very day preceding that appointed for the assassination. It was suggested to Darnley aside, by several of his confederates, that it would be a convenient opportunity for setting upon the little Italian, who was perfectly defenceless, and despatching him with their daggers as he left the tennis-court; but he replied, "No; he would have him taken with the Queen at supper, that he might be taunted in her presence."[2] The malignant idea of agitating and insulting his royal consort, whose situation pleaded for all his tenderness, was probably inspired by Darnley's resentment at her going in state to open the Parliament without him on the preceding day; but assuredly he would not have played at tennis with any man whom he suspected of injuring him in the manner attributed to Riccio by the conspirators. It must be remembered that Darnley's personal jealousy rests on the credibility of the narrative prepared by Morton and Ruthven, to excuse their own conduct, and sent by them to Cecil for his corrections, who, of course, gave it such a turn as suited best the political object of vilifying the Scottish Queen. According to one of the Italian contemporary narratives of the conspiracy,[3] it was not Darnley, but one of the conspirators, who objected to the murder being perpetrated in the tennis-court, or anywhere but in the presence of the Queen, saying, "that if it were done in her apartment, the people might be made to believe he was found under such circumstances

[1] Italian Memorial in Labanoff's Appendix, vol. vii. p. 60.
[2] Morton and Ruthven's Narrative.
[3] Addressed to Cosmo I., Grand-Duke of Tuscany. Printed in Prince Labanoff's Appendix, vol. vii., from the original document in the Archives de Medicis, Florence.

that the King could do no less than have him killed on the spot."

The details of the assassination of David Riccio are, as a matter of course, represented by the persons engaged in the perpetration of the crime, in the way considered by them and their confederates, Randolph, Bedford, and Cecil, best calculated to excuse so flagrant a violation of the laws of God and their country. In their narrative they defame their Queen, and charge the whole blame of their proceedings on their dupe and besotted instrument, Darnley, to whom the title of King, hitherto disallowed by the English Sovereign and her authorities, is, in these political libels, very punctiliously given. What credit, we would ask, ought to be accorded to the words of men who, by their own showing, acted as suborned bravoes by placing their pistols and daggers at the disposal of an intemperate ill-conducted youth, not past schoolboy's estate, suffering themselves to be led by him through the bedchamber of his royal consort to commit a dastardly murder on a defenceless man in her presence, though she was in an advanced state of pregnancy? The conjugal wrongs of Darnley are insinuated as the excuse for their proceedings. But why did not this powerful party of his avengers, headed by the Lord-Chancellor Morton, act in a legal manner, by calling the attention of Parliament to the misconduct of the Queen, if she had done amiss? They had entered into a treasonable league to procure the crown-matrimonial for Darnley, by slaying and extirpating every one who should oppose them. But it would have been more to the purpose to have shown cause in the national Senate for excluding the Queen from the office of chief magistrate by proving her to be a statute-breaker, and then to have put it to the vote of the Three Estates whether the injured husband should not be invested with the Sovereign authority and the tuition of the expected heir of the realm. This, if Mary had violated her moral duties, they would have been only too happy to have done: the treacherous and unmanly conduct to which they resorted proves they had no foundation for their slanders.

Mary has written a concise business-like report of the

outrage committed in her presence, and the treasonable proceedings of the conspirators, mentioning, in sorrow rather than anger, the complicity of her husband—a fact too notorious to be concealed; but instead of enlarging on his baseness, she endeavours, like a good wife, to keep his faults in the shade, and affords convincing proofs of her regard for his honour, by giving him credit for better feelings than are imputed to him by his treacherous confederates. Mary's recital is very brief in comparison with either edition of the narrative of the assassins. She had no crime either to conceal or defend, and she uses the simple but pathetic language of a person deeply aggrieved, but who relates her wrongs without exaggeration, confining herself to what passed under her personal observation, as far as her agitation and terror permitted her to observe, of the conflicting horrors of the scene. Her French physician was an eyewitness of the tragedy; and it is probable that one of the narratives preserved in the archives of the Lorraine family was from his pen. Sir James Melville and Lesley, Bishop of Ross, were both in Holyrood the same night the murder was committed. The first has given a lively sketch of the agitating scene in his autobiography; and to the historical notes of the latter, Adam Blackwood, Mary's contemporary biographer, was indebted for the proceedings of the conspirators in the perpetration of the deed. Additional light is thrown on these by the minutely circumstantial reports written for the information of Cosmo the Great, Duke of Tuscany, by an Italian resident in the Court of Holyrood,[1] possessed of no common means of information, illustrative of the under-currents by which the troubled stream of Mary Stuart's regal life was agitated, and who had no conceivable motive for imposing false or garbled statements on a Prince so intelligent as Cosmo de Medicis, whose political interests were nowise

[1] These very important records, to which our biography of Mary Stuart has already been indebted for valuable particulars connected with the diplomatic career of David Riccio, were fortunately preserved in the archives of the extinct family of the Medicis at Florence, where they slumbered unnoticed, till elicited by the unwearied research of that illustrious documentarian the Russian Prince Labanoff, and published in his last Appendix volume.

affected by the passions and prejudices of the conflicting parties in the remote realm of Scotland. From a careful collation of these documents with the other authorities, several curious incidents, never before amalgamated with Mary's personal history, have been elicited, and a fuller and more consistent narrative of this important episode in her life offered to the readers of her biography.

The day appointed for the great enterprise by the conspirators, with consent of their infatuated tool Darnley, was Saturday, March 9, 1565–6, as concerted between them, the Earl of Moray, and the other rebel Lords in England. In the gloaming of the evening of that day, five hundred men, some in secret armour, the rest in jacks and steel-bonnets, with guns, pistols, swords, bucklers, Jedburgh staves, and halberts, assembled themselves in the Abbey Close, and about the Queen's Palace of Holyrood.[1] The Earl of Morton introduced about eight score of those judged by him fittest for the purpose into the inner court; he then ordered the gates to be locked, and took possession of the keys.[2] As he was Mary's Lord-Chancellor, no suspicion was entertained respecting his intentions by her inferior servants, whose loyalty at all times shamed the titled traitors by whom she was surrounded. When Morton had taken these steps he came to Darnley, accompanied by a party of the banded conspirators, and told him all was ready. Darnley was ready too, having taken his supper an hour earlier than usual, in company with Moray's brother-in-law, Lord Lindsay of the Byres, George Douglas the Postulate, and Lord Ruthven, who, though dying of an incurable bodily malady, and vexed with a burning fever, had risen from his sick-bed on the keen scent for blood: scarcely able to support himself, he had donned his armour to play the leading part in the anticipated butchery. Darnley's suite of apartments was on the ground-floor, immediately under those of his royal spouse, to which he had at all times access by means of a small spiral staircase,

[1] Goodall, from Henry Yair's MS. Trial.
[2] Sir James Melville's Memoirs.

called a limanga, leading through a private passage to a door opening into her bedroom concealed behind the tapestry hangings. Of this door he alone, besides her Majesty, possessed a key. Darnley, now an inveterate drinker, must, we think, have been plied by his evil companions with many a deep potation ere he could so far forget his duty as a prince, a gentleman, and a husband, as to abuse the conjugal privilege of free access at all hours to his royal consort's chamber, by availing himself of that means of introducing a band of murderous traitors into her private sanctuary.[1] If we may credit their statement, the proposal of doing so, which probably even their hardihood had not gone so far as to suggest, emanated from himself. "I will have open the door," said he, "and keep her in talk till you come in,"[2] only one person at a time being able to ascend the narrow stair.

Mary being indisposed, had been enjoined by her physicians to keep herself very quiet, and sustain her strength with animal food, instead of observing the Lent fast.[3] She was, therefore, supping privately in her closet—a small cabinet about twelve feet in length and ten in breadth, within her bedroom —in company with Jane, Countess of Argyll, and Lord Robert Stuart, Commendator of Holyrood Abbey (her illegitimate brother and sister), attended by Beton, Laird of Creich, one of the masters of her household, Arthur Erskine, her equerry, her French doctor, and several other persons. David Riccio was also present, the Queen expressly says, "among others our servants."[4] Her statement is confirmed by the testimony of that faithful historian Camden, who, writing with the key to all the mysterious tragedies of her life and reign, Cecil's secret correspondence, before him, states "that David Riccio was standing at the sideboard, eating something that had been sent to him from

[1] A very graphic and correct account of these apartments will be found in Bell's Life of Mary Stuart, and a plan of the Queen's chamber and cabinet in Mackay's Castles and Prisons of Mary Stuart.

[2] Narrative of Morton and Ruthven in Keith's Appendix.

[3] Queen Mary's Letter to the Archbishop of Glasgow, containing her recital of the outrage, dated April 2, 1566, in Keith. Chalmers' Hist. of Mary Stuart.

[4] Ibid.

the Queen's table."[1] This was in strict accordance with the customs of the Court and period. The assassins, in the plausible brief prepared for their defence and Mary's defamation, by their special advisers and confederates in the murder, Randolph and Bedford, and also in Cecil's edition of the political document bearing the name of Morton and Ruthven's Narrative of the Slaughter of David, affirm, "that he was sitting at the other end of the table, with his cap on." The cap is undoubtedly an English interpolation, not mentioned by Buchanan or Knox, neither of whom would have failed to enlarge on a circumstance so much to their purpose, if it had not been liable to be disproved by numerous witnesses. That Riccio was seated at the royal board, though denied, by good authorities, was not impossible; and even if it were so, what does it prove?—or in what other light can such a circumstance be regarded than as a trait of the good feeling and characteristic courtesy of a Sovereign, whose mind and manners were too far in advance of a semi-barbarous age to treat her Secretary—a man of signal attainments and accomplishments—with no greater respect than if he had been a lackey? The generous spirit and refined taste of Mary Stuart taught her to reject the slavish idolatries usually exacted by regality in the mediæval centuries.

Darnley, having led the way up the private stair from his apartment into his wife's bedroom, entered her cabinet alone, about seven o'clock. Neither surprise nor disturbance was manifested at his appearance by the Queen or her company; on the contrary, he seemed to be to Mary a welcome guest; for when he placed himself beside her in the double chair of state, one seat whereof had in his absence remained unoccupied, she kindly inclined herself towards him, to receive and reciprocate the conjugal caresses with which he greeted her: they kissed each other, and embraced, and Darnley cast his arm about her waist, with deceitful demonstrations of fondness.[2] Conventional civilities were

[1] Camden's Annals of Queen Elizabeth. To this Strangwage, Udal, and Crawford's Memoirs agree.

[2] Memorial on Scotch Affairs in the Archives de Medicis, printed in Labanoff's Appendix, vol. vii.

next exchanged between the royal pair. "My Lord, have you supped?" inquired Mary: "I believed you would have finished your supper by this time." Darnley evasively replied, indirectly implying an apology for interrupting a meal he did not intend to share.[1] Before the utterance of another word, the tapestry masking the secret passage into the Queen's bedroom was pushed aside, and Ruthven, pale, ghastly, and attenuated, intruded himself upon the scene. The evil reputation of this nobleman, both as a sorcerer and an assassin, had from the first rendered him an object of instinctive horror to Mary. He had been withal the sworn foe of her mother; yet, in consequence of his being the husband of Lady Lennox's sister, she had, since her marriage with Darnley, compelled herself to treat him with civility. She knew he had long been confined to his bed with an incurable disease; and as it had been reported to her on that very day that he was in mortal extremity, she concluded, from his wild and haggard appearance, and the strange fashion in which he burst into her presence, that he had escaped from his chamber in a sudden access of delirium, imagining himself perhaps pursued by the vengeful spectre of his murdered victim, Charteris, Laird of Kincleugh.[2] Under the folds of his loose gown, Mary could see that his gaunt figure was sheathed in mail. He brandished a naked rapier in his hand, and had donned a steel casque over the nightcap in which his livid brow was muffled: a more frightful apparition could scarcely have startled the eyes of a young teeming matron. Her first impulse was to utter an exclamation of terror and surprise; but recollecting herself, she kindly addressed him in these words: "My Lord, I was coming to visit you in your chamber, having been told you were very ill, and now you enter our presence in your armour. What does this mean?"[3]

[1] Memorials on Scotch Affairs in the Archives de Medicis, printed in Labanoff's Appendix, vol. vii.

[2] Assassinated by Ruthven in 1554, to prevent his gaining the favourable decision of the judges in a lawsuit in which they were opposed.—Lesley, Hist. Scot.

[3] Memorial on Scottish Affairs in the Archives de Medicis, printed in Labanoff's Appendix, vol. vii.

Ruthven flung himself into a chair, and with a sarcastic sneer replied, "I have, indeed, been very ill, but I find myself well enough to come here for your good." She, observing his look and manner, said, "And what good can you do me? You come not in the fashion of one who meaneth well."[1] "There is no harm intended to your Grace," replied Ruthven, "nor to any one, but yonder poltroon, David; it is he with whom I have to speak." "What hath he done?" inquired Mary. "Ask the King your husband, madam."[2] She turned in surprise to Darnley, who had now risen, and was leaning on the back of her chair. "What is the meaning of this?" she demanded. He faltered, affected ignorance, and replied, "I know nothing of the matter."[3] Mary on this, assuming a tone of authority, ordered Ruthven to leave her presence, under penalty of treason. As he paid no attention to her behest, Arthur Erskine and Lord Keith (who was one of her Masters of the Household), with her French apothecary, attempted to expel him forcibly. "Lay no hands on me, for I will not be handled," exclaimed Ruthven, brandishing his rapier.[4] "Then another of the *banditti*," as our Italian authority not inappropriately designates the confederates, made his appearance with a horse-pistol, called a dag, in his hand. He was immediately followed by others of the party, in warlike array. "What is the meaning of this?" exclaimed Mary; "do you seek my life?"[5]

"No, madam," replied Ruthven, "but we will have out yonder villain Davie," making a pass at him as he spoke. The Queen prevented the blow by seizing his wrist, and, rising to her feet intrepidly, interposed the sacred shield of her royal person between her ferocious Baron and the defenceless little foreigner, who had retreated into the recess of the embayed window, and was holding in his trembling hand the dagger he had drawn, but had not the courage, or possibly the skill, to use in his own defence, his weapon

[1] Memorial on Scotch Affairs in the Archives de Medicis, printed in Labanoff's Appendix, vol. vii.
[2] Narrative of Morton and Ruthven, in Keith's Appendix.
[3] Queen's Recital. [4] Morton and Ruthven's Narrative.
[5] Italian Memorial, in Labanoff's Appendix.

being the pen of a ready writer—his manual skill confined to the lute or viol.[1] "If my Secretary have been guilty of any misdemeanour," said Mary to the assailants, "I promise to exhibit him before the Lords of the Parliament, that he may be dealt with according to the usual forms of justice." "Here is the means of justice, madam," cried one of the assassins, producing a rope. "Madam," said David aside to the Queen, "I am a dead man." "Fear not," she replied aloud, "the King will never suffer you to be slain in my presence; neither can he forget your faithful services."[2] It was probably this appeal to her husband's better feelings, coupled with his remembrance of his former obligations to Riccio, that, touching a tender chord in Darnley's bosom, produced the hesitation and irresolution described by the assassins themselves—"the King stood amazed, and wist not what to do." But he was in the hands of those who would not suffer him to draw back. "Sir," cried Ruthven, "take the Queen your wife and sovereign to you," thus reminding their unhappy tool that he was expected by his accomplices to perform his promise of taking on himself the responsibility of exerting masculine force, if requisite, in a personal struggle with her whom, by every law of nature, as well as by his oath of allegiance and of knighthood, he was bound to defend and cherish.

The slogan yell, "A Douglas, a Douglas!" now resounded through that quarter of the palace.[3] Morton and eighty of his followers, impatient of the delay of the King and the party he had introduced through his own privileged approach into his royal consort's apartments, were ascending the grand staircase in full force, and prepared to conclude the enterprise "by killing, slaying, and extirpating," according to the letter of their bond, "all or any one who might oppose them, whomsoever it might be."[4] The doors of her Majesty's presence-chamber were presently forced; her servants fled in terror, without venturing the slightest show of resistance to the overwhelming numbers of the ruffian band.

[1] French Report in Pièces et Documens.
[2] Labanoff's Appendix.
[3] Melville's Memoirs.
[4] Tytler.

The sanctuary of the Queen's bedroom was next profaned by the invaders, and the glare of their torches threw an ominous light on the conflicting agitated group at the farther end of the cabinet. The struggle of David Riccio for life had been prolonged, in consequence of the determined resistance offered by the Queen and the irresolution of her husband. The table, which had hitherto served as a barrier to prevent the near approach of the assailants, was now flung violently over on the Queen, with the viands, knives, and all that was upon it, by the fresh inbreak of unscrupulous men rushing forward to the work of death.[1] Lady Argyll caught up one of the lighted candles in her hand, as it was falling, and thus preserved her royal sister and herself from being enveloped in flames. The pandemonium to which Mary's usually peaceful cabinet was suddenly transformed needed not that additional horror. She was for a moment, it seems, overpowered with surprise, mortal terror, and pain, for she must have been severely hurt by the table and heavy plate upon it being hurled against her person: she would, moreover, have been overthrown by a shock so rude and unexpected, and probably crushed to death beneath the feet of the inhuman traitors who were raging round her, if Ruthven had not taken her in his arms and put her into those of Darnley, telling her at the same time "not to be alarmed, for there was no harm meant to her, and all that was done was her husband's deed"[2]—of him "who had come," as she exclaimed, in the bitterness of her heart, "to betray her with a Judas kiss.[3]" Her indignant sense of the outrage offered to her, both as Queen and woman, revived her sinking energies, instead of swooning, as they expected: she burst into a torrent of indignant reproaches, and calling the unmannerly intruders "Traitors and villains!" ordered them to begone, under penalty of the severest punishment, and declared her resolution of protecting her faithful servant. "We will have out that gallant!" cried

[1] Melville. Ruthven and Morton's Narrative. Queen Mary's recital.
[2] Narrative of Ruthven and Morton—Keith's Appendix.
[3] Report of Paul de Foix in Teulet's Pièces et Documens relatifs des Affaires d'Escosses, vol. ii.

Ruthven, pointing with his finger to the trembling Secretary, who had shrunk backwards to the very extremity of the window recess, behind the stately figure of the Queen, for refuge, while she continued intrepidly to confront the throng of banded ruffians.

"Let him go, madam; they will not harm him," exclaimed Darnley.[1]

"Save my life, madam! Save my life for God's dear sake!" shrieked Riccio, clinging to her robe for protection. Mary in vain essayed the eloquence of tears, entreaties, and expostulations; she adjured her subjects, by their duty to her as their Queen, by the consideration due to her sex, and above all to her present situation, sufficiently apparent, not to shed blood in her presence, adding "that it would be more for their honour as well as hers that her Secretary, if he had offended, should be proceeded against according to the forms of justice."[2] "Justitia, justitia!"[3] reiterated the wretched foreigner, catching in his despair at the word. One less regarded by the ruthless men who were banded for his murder he could scarcely have used. The first blow was given by the Postulate, George Douglas, who stabbed him over the Queen's shoulder with such fury that the blood was sprinkled over her garments, and the dagger left sticking in his side; others followed the example; and Darnley having succeeded in unlocking the tenacious grasp with which the wretched victim clung to the Queen's robe, he was dragged, while vainly crying for mercy and for justice, from her feet.[4] Mary would still have struggled for his preservation, but Darnley, forcing her into a chair, stood behind it, holding her so tightly embraced that she could not rise. The ferocious fanatic, Andrew Ker of Faudonside, presented a cocked pistol to her side, with a furious imprecation, telling her he would shoot her dead if she offered resistance. "Fire," she undauntedly replied, "if you respect not the

[1] Italian Memorial, in Labanoff's Appendix.
[2] Birrel's Diary. Diurnal of Occurrents. Tytler.
[3] Birrel's Diary; Tytler; Chalmers; Keith.
[4] Melville. Italian Memorials. Adam Blackwood declares that the first blow was given by Morton.

royal infant in my womb."[1] The weapon was hastily turned aside—it was by the hand of Darnley. Mary afterwards declared "she felt the coldness of the iron through her dress, and that Faudonside had actually pulled the trigger, but the pistol hung fire."[2] Nor was this the only attempt made on the life of the defenceless Queen on that dreadful night, for Patrick Bellenden, the brother of the Justice-Clerk, aimed a regicidal thrust at her bosom, under cover of the tumultuous onslaught on David; but his malignant purpose was observed, and prevented by the gallant young English refugee, Anthony Standen, her page, who, with equal courage and presence of mind, parried the blow by striking the rapier aside with the torch he had been holding to light the music score the Queen and David, with others of the company, had been singing in parts that evening. This interesting fact, which confirms the statements of Adam Blackwood, Belforest,[3] and Mary herself, "that a blow was aimed at her by one of the assassins with a sword or dagger during the melée," was derived by our authority from the lips of Anthony himself, when an old man residing at Rome.[4]

The assassins vehemently deny the imputation of endangering the life of the Queen and her unborn babe, by committing the brutal murder in her presence, and menacing her with their weapons; but this protestation comes as a matter of course from them, as a prudent denial of the most atrocious aggravation of their crime—a crime committed under circumstances so revolting to common decency, to say nothing of the laws of conscience and humanity, that we know not why the slightest credit should be attached to their assertions more than to those of Rush, Thurtel, Mrs Manning and her husband, or any other notorious assassins who have added the sin of hypocritical professions of godliness to their breach of God's holy commandments, and

Italian Memorials in Labanoff's Appendix.

[2] Ibid. Blackwood. [3] Innocens de Marie Stuart.

[4] Inedited Relation of the Life and Death of Mary Stuart Queen of Scotland, from the Memoirs of the Pontificate of Sextus V. in the archives of the Capitol. I am indebted to the courtesy and learned research of the Roman Prince Massimo for the communication of a faithful transcript of this curious and deeply interesting MS.

taken His name in vain to cloak their guilty violation of His statutes against murder and false witness.

"And whereas," say they, "her Majesty" allegeth "that night that David was slain, some held pistols to her Majesty's breast, some struck so near her Majesty that she felt the coldness of the iron, with many other such things, we take God to record there was not one stroke in her presence; nor was David stricken till he was at the farther door of her Majesty's outer chamber. And her Majesty maketh all these allegations to bring the said Earl of Morton, Lord Ruthven, and their accomplices, into great hatred with foreign princes, and with the nobility and commons of the said realm, who have experience of the contrary, and know there was no evil meant to the Queen's body. The Eternal God, who hath the rule of all princes in his hand, send her his Holy Spirit, that she may rule and govern with clemency and mercy."[1] "Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy." But what a mockery of mockeries was such a prayer as this from the unmerciful!—two ruthless assassins, whose hands were reeking with the blood of a fellow-creature, to whom they, the Lord-Chancellor of Scotland and the High Sheriff of Perth, had denied the benefit of a trial, and assisted fifty-six of their accomplices to mangle with knives and daggers, while he was crying for mercy and for justice! Now let us turn to Mary's account of the matter; for surely, according to the laws of evidence, her deposition as a witness would outweigh the assertions of the murderers. Mark also with what dignified and emphatic brevity she recites her facts: "Upon the 9th day of March instant, we being at even about seven hours [seven o'clock] in our cabinet at our supper, sociated with our sister the Countess of Argyll, our brother the Commendator of Holyrood House, [the] Laird of Creich, Arthur Erskine, and certain others our domestic servitors, in quiet manner, especially by reason of our evil disposition being counselled to sustain ourselves with flesh, having almost passed to the end of seven months in our birth, the

[1] Narrative of the Slaughter of David Riccio by Ruthven and Morton, dated April 20th. Edited by Cecil.

King our husband came to us in our cabinet, and placed him beside us at our supper. The Earl of Morton and Lord Lindsay, with their assisters, *boden* in warlike manner, to the number of eight score persons or thereby, kept and occupied the whole entry of our palace of Holyrood House, so that as they believed it was not possible to any person to escape forth of the same. In the mean time the Lord Ruthven, *boden* in like manner, with his accomplices, took entry perforce in our cabinet, and there seeing our Secretary David Riccio, among others our servants, declared he had to speak to him. In this instant we required the King our husband if he knew anything of that enterprise, who denied the same. Also we commanded the Lord Ruthven, under the pain of treason, to avoid him forth of our presence, declaring we should exhibit the said David before the Lords of Parliament, to be punished if any sort he had offended; notwithstanding the said Lord Ruthven perforce invaded him in our presence; he [David] then for refuge took safeguard and retired him behind our back, and [Ruthven] with his [band] cast down our table upon ourself, put violent hands upon him, struck him over our shoulder with whingars, one part of them [the associate murderers] standing before our face with bended *dags* [horse-pistols cocked], most cruelly took him forth of our cabinet, and at the entry of our chamber gave him fifty-six strokes with whingars and swords. In doing thereof we were not only struck with great *dreadour*, but also by sundry considerations was most justly induced to take extreme fear of our life."[1]

The delicacy with which Mary refrains from relating some of the most painful circumstances which occurred, in order to avoid exposing her husband's baseness, is worthy of attention, her wifely tenderness for his reputation affording touching proof of her affection for the bosom traitor who had blindly united with their mutual foes to inflict so great a wrong. Truly she might have said with the Psalmist, "If it had been an enemy who had done this, I could have borne it; but it was even thou, my companion,

[1] Queen Mary's Letter to the Archbishop of Glasgow, printed in Keith, 332.

my guide, and mine own familiar friend." As the ruffians were dragging Riccio through the Queen's bedchamber, he clung to the bedstead till one of the assassins forced him to relinquish his hold, by giving him a dreadful blow on the arm with the stock of a harquebuss.[1] Such was the ferocity of the murderers that they wounded each other in their eagerness to plunge their swords and daggers into the body of their hapless victim,[2] he all the time uttering the most agonising cries, which the Queen hearing, exclaimed, "Ah, poor Davit, my good and faithful servant! may the Lord have mercy on your soul."[3] And here it may be permitted to remark, that this pious aspiration to the throne of grace, in behalf of the spirit then passing in agony through the valley of the shadow of death, savours of the holy pitifulness of Christian charity, not of the unhallowed fervours of lawless love. Far different were the feelings and deportment of Mary Stuart, in that awful hour, from those imputed to her by men who scrupled not to send an immortal soul to its great account, without according the mercy of one poor moment for the preparation of a single prayer. "Such desire," says their English friend and confederate Drury, "to have him surely and speedily slain, that in jabbing at him so many at once, some bestowed their daggers where neither they meant it, nor the receivers willing to receive it."[4]

Darnley had consented to the crime, and given the treason the sanction of his presence, but he had revolted from the barbarism of lending his personal assistance in the butchery. As a Prince and a gentleman, he could not force his hand to plunge a knife into the unfortunate creature, with whom he had lived on terms of familiar friendship, and had even played at tennis with him on the preceding day. His heart failed, his mind misgave him, and he would fain have drawn back; but for him there was no retreat. George Douglas, the

[1] Labanoff's Appendix, vol. vii., first Italian document.
[2] Drury to Sir William Cecil, March 27. Tytler, Hist. Scot., vol. vi. p. 30.
[3] Second Italian Memorial—Labanoff's Appendix; from the Archives de Medicis.
[4] Drury to Cecil, March 27—Tytler, Hist. Scot., vol. vii.

Postulate, who had dealt the first blow to the unfortunate Secretary, by stabbing him over the Queen's shoulder with his own whingar, concluded the business by snatching Darnley's dagger from the sheath and plunging it into the mangled corpse, exclaiming at the same time, "This is the blow of the King," leaving the royal weapon sticking in the wound, to draw public attention to the complicity of Mary's consort in the assassination, and prevent any credit from being given to his denial by either her or her people.[1] They had at first proposed to hang the unfortunate Secretary, and others of Mary's officers with him, having brought cords for that purpose.[2] With those cords they now bound the murdered man's feet together, and dragging him along the floor of the Queen's chamber, hurled him down the narrow staircase into the King's lobby, where his corpse was stripped and spoiled of the decorations, especially a jewel of great value, which he had hanging round his neck at the time of the murder,[3]—perhaps the costly diamond sent to him by Moray from England, to purchase his pardon. David was attired, as etiquette required on that fatal night, being in attendance on the Queen, in a rich court-dress, called in the nomenclature of the costume of the period "a night-gown,"[4] of black figured damask, faced with fur, a satin doublet, and russet-coloured velvet hose, or *haute-chaussée*.

Mary and Darnley were left alone together in their cabinet, and the key of the door was turned upon them both, while the assassins completed their sanguinary work, and disposed of the body of the murdered man.[5] During this brief pause, Mary, exhausted by the agonising conflict she had endured, wept silently. Darnley, whose feelings were far less enviable even than those of his injured wife,

[1] Knox. Teulet's Pièces et Documens relatifs des Affaires d'Escosses.
[2] Italian Memorial—Labanoff's Appendix.
[3] Bedford and Randolph to Cecil.
[4] Even in the last century a lady's evening dress was so termed, as we may observe in the old plays and novels. Yet some writers, in ignorance of this fact, have enlarged on the impropriety of David Riccio appearing in the Queen's presence in his robe-de-chambre. His wardrobe was very costly.
[5] Italian Memorial on Scotch Affairs in the Archives de Medicis—Labanoff's Appendix, vol. vii. Lord Herries's Memoir.

continued to protest "that no harm was intended." He had said so at first, and he repeated the same words even after the cries of the murdered victim were hushed in death.[1]

One of Darnley's equerries now stole into the cabinet. Mary roused herself to inquire "whether David had been put into ward, and where?" "Madam," replied the equerry, "it is useless to speak of David, for the man is dead."[2] This was corroborated by one of the agitated ladies, who rushed in to communicate the dreadful tidings, "that she had seen the mangled remains of the murdered man," and "that it was said all had been done by the King's order." "Ah, traitor, and son of a traitor!" exclaimed the Queen, turning to her perfidious husband, "is this the recompense thou givest to her who hath covered thee with benefits, and raised thee to honours so great?" then, overpowered by the bitterness of her feelings, she swooned.[3] Brief was the interval of repose which nature's weakness claimed; she was roused, by the rude re-entrance of Ruthven and his savage followers, to fresh consciousness of misery. They came with their blood-stained hands and garments, reeking from the recent slaughter, to rate, to menace, and insult their Sovereign, both as Queen and woman. Ruthven flung himself into a chair, and called for drink, complaining that "he was sore *felled* by his sickness." "Is this your malady?" exclaimed the Queen, with sarcastic emphasis, as he eagerly drained the goblet which one of her French pages filled and brought to him. "God forbid your Majesty had such," he rejoined.[4] Apparently to avoid being provoked to answer his taunts, she left the cabinet, followed by her husband, and passed into her bedchamber, no longer sacred to her royal privacy. The frightful state in which it had been left by the ferocious traitors, who had chosen that peaceful sanctuary as the scene of their butcher-work, may be imagined. The ensanguined traces of the murder, which are ineffaceable, were then fresh and warm, as they had oozed from the death-wounds of the murdered man.

[1] Italian Memorial on Scotch Affairs in the Archives de Medicis—Labanoff's Appendix, vol. vii. Lord Herries's Memoir. [2] Ibid.
[3] Second Italian Memorial, in Labanoff's Appendix.
[4] Ruthven's Narrative.

Mary greatly blamed her husband that he should be, as his accomplices triumphantly had boasted, "the author of so foul a deed," and began sorrowfully to reason with him, and to inquire into his motives.[1] "My Lord," said she, "why have you caused to do this wicked deed to me, considering that I took you from low estate, and made you my husband? What offence have I given you, that you should do me such shame?"[2] To this pathetic address Darnley, according to the statement of the assassins, replied in a recriminating speech, which of course was not softened in Cecil's edition of their unfriendly report of the conversation, after he had provoked the extremity of their malice by repudiating them and their fiendlike counsels; but their great object was to give his words such a turn as might most effectually serve to affix a stain on the hitherto spotless honour of their Queen—an offence which they well knew Mary was far less likely to forgive than his treasonable attempt to make himself master of her crown. The following is their malignant version of his words: "I have good reason for me, for since yonder fellow David came in credit with your Majesty, you neither regarded me, entertained me, nor trusted me after your wonted fashion; for every day you were wont to come to my chamber before dinner, and pass the time with me, and this long time you have not done so; and when I came to your Majesty's chamber, you bare me little company, except David were third person. And after supper your Majesty used to sit up at the cards with the said David till one or two after midnight; and this is the entertainment I have had of you this long time."[3]

Mary might have answered, with truth, that her Secretary, who had been employed in affairs of state long before Darnley ever set foot in Scotland, had stood his friend by promoting his marriage with her, and had nothing to do with the estrangement his own perversity and folly had caused, and that the neglect and desertion were on his side, not on

[1] Ruthven's Narrative.
[2] Randolph and Bedford to Cecil, March 25. Narrative of Ruthven and Morton.
[3] Ibid.

hers; but she contented herself with implying the latter fact, by observing "that it was not a gentlewoman's duty to come to her husband's chamber, but rather the husband's to come to the wife's."[1] "How came you to my chamber in the beginning, and ever till within the last six months?" was Darnley's rejoinder; wilfully forgetting that, under the circumstances of their secret marriage and his long illness, he had been wont to receive those endearing marks of her attention in the privacy of his own apartments, before he was privileged, by the public solemnisation of their wedlock in the Chapel-royal, to enter her chamber except at her levees, and how cruelly he had insulted and repelled her the last time she entered his chamber.

If we may trust the inimical report of the assassins, Darnley proceeded to address such unseemly language to the Queen, in their presence, that she indignantly told him "she would live with him as his wife no longer." Whereupon Ruthven favoured her with a lecture on her conjugal duties—remarks which came strangely from the lips of a person who had contracted matrimony with another man's wife during her husband's lifetime. Mary told him "that if she and her infant perished, she would leave the revenge thereof to her royal kindred in France and Spain." Ruthven sarcastically observed, "those noble Princes were over great personages to meddle with such a poor man as he was; and that if she or her child perished, or any other evil befel the realm in consequence of what was done that night, she must blame her husband, and not any of them;" adding, "that the more angry she appeared, the worse the world would judge."[2] Mary's high spirit never quailed before the ruffian who menaced and insulted her. "I trust," she said, "that God, who beholdeth this from the high heavens, will avenge my wrongs, and move that which shall be born of me to root out you and your treacherous posterity."[3] Her prophetical denunciation was fully accomplished by her son on the house of Ruthven. It was not often that Mary

[1] Randolph and Bedford to Cecil, March 25. Narrative of Ruthven and Morton. [2] Ibid.
[3] Adam Blackwood's Life of Queen Mary. Melville's Memoirs.

Stuart indulged in the imprecatory strain, but the provocation she was suffering was enough to rouse the lion-like blood of the Plantagenets. There were moments when she dashed away her tears and spoke of vengeance, observing, that "if her Secretary were slain, it should be dear blood to some of them."[1].

But now a mingled clamour and clash of weapons was heard in the court and lobbies below, and Lord Gray, one of the conspirators, knocked hard and fast at the door of the Queen's chamber, to announce the tidings that the Earls of Huntley, Bothwell, Caithness, and Sutherland, the Lords Fleming, Livingstone, and Tullibardine, the Comptroller, with their officers and servants, were fighting in the close against the Earl of Morton and his party. Darnley, hearing this, offered to go down; but Ruthven, having probably seen reason to distrust him, prevented him, and said he would go down himself, "sarcastically bidding his Majesty remain where he was, and entertain the Queen in the mean time;"[2] and then staggered out of the chamber, supported between two of his confederates. The part assigned to Darnley, from the first, was to coerce and guard his royal wife, whom it was intended to keep as a close prisoner; but he had in reality no more freedom of action than herself. The royal pair were again left together during a few agitating moments of suspense. Darnley took this opportunity of informing the Queen that he had sent for the Earl of Moray and the other rebel Lords to return again. She answered, "that it was no fault of hers they had been so long away, for she could have been well content to have had them home again, but for angering him." Even Morton and Ruthven allow that this was the fact, and bear witness to his displeasure at the remission Mary had granted to the Duke of Châtelherault.[3]

The enterprise for her rescue was headed by Bothwell and Huntley, who had rallied and led forth the Queen's serving-men and kitchen meine, armed with spits, cleavers, knives, and whatever weapons they could find, to drive out

[1] Ruthven and Morton's Narrative—Keith's Appendix.
[2] Ibid. [3] Ibid.

the invaders; but finding themselves greatly outnumbered, they retreated back into the gallery, where a parley took place between them and Ruthven, who invited them to a conference in Bothwell's chamber. Ruthven there made an earnest attempt to induce him to join the conspiracy, by telling him that "it was all invented by the King, and that the banished Lords were recalled, and would arrive before day" —assuring both Huntley and him "that all disputes should then be made up between them and Moray and Argyll to their satisfaction;" whereupon they shook hands and drank together.[1] The Earl of Atholl had been meantime detained by the Secretary Lethington, who, though deeply implicated in the plot, had eschewed taking part in the practical butchery, and invited himself to sup with that nobleman, for the twofold purpose of keeping guard over him, and proving an *alibi* in the probable event of the Queen getting the better of the conspirators. Atholl was very angry at the proceedings, and sharply reproved Ruthven for being party to such a deed; but Ruthven said "it was the King's secret, and he was afraid of revealing it to him, lest he should have told the Queen."[2] Atholl, on this, required permission to leave the palace and return into his own country. Ruthven gave fair words to all the Lords; but Bothwell, Huntley, and Sir James Balfour, knowing they were marked men, lost no time in effecting their escape, by letting themselves down with cords from a back window looking upon a little garden behind the Palace, where the lions were lodged,[3]—Mary having, like her father, a menagerie both at Holyrood and Stirling.

Ruthven, who had swallowed, by his own account, fresh potations in Bothwell's chamber, unceremoniously intruded himself, for the third time, into the Queen's bedroom, for the purpose of announcing to her husband the failure of the attempt of her faithful servants for her deliverance, and proceeded to taunt her with having admitted Bothwell and Huntley, whom he called traitors, into her council by David's advice, accusing her, at the same time,

[1] Narrative of Ruthven and Morton—Keith's Appendix.
[2] Ibid. [3] Melville's Memoirs.

of tyranny and misgovernment.[1] Mary was, nevertheless, the idol of her people, of which she presently received a gratifying proof; for the rumour of her distress having reached the Provost of Edinburgh, he caused the alarum-bell to be rung for assistance, when not less than five hundred burgesses, understanding the Queen was in danger, appeared in warlike array in answer to the summons, and, hastening with him to the palace, required to see their Sovereign.[2] But she was not permitted to approach the windows, being brutally threatened by Ruthven and the other assassins, that "if she attempted to speak to the loyal muster, they would cut her into collops, and throw her over the walls;"[3] while her false husband, being thrust forward in her place, opened the window, and bade the Provost "pass home with his company, as nothing was amiss," adding, "the Queen and he were merry."[4] "Let us see our Queen, and hear her speak for herself," was the reply of the Provost and his true-hearted followers, to which Darnley imperiously rejoined, "Provost, know you not I am King? I command you and your company to pass home to your houses." The people, perceiving by this that the Queen was a prisoner in the hands of her ungrateful English husband and his faction, were greatly irritated, and spoke of devoting all who were against her, within that palace, to fire and sword. Then the conspirators told them "that it was only a quarrel with her French servants;" but this not pacifying her true-hearted champions, it was further declared to them, "that the Italian Secretary was slain, because he had been detected in an intrigue with the Pope, the King of Spain, and other foreign potentates, for the purpose of destroying the true Evangile, and introducing Popery again into Scotland." Whereupon the people quietly dispersed, being assured that the Queen was well, and in no danger.[5]

When the honest citizens had retired, Ruthven told the

[1] Queen Mary's Letter to the Archbishop of Glasgow.
[2] Knox. Italian Memorial in Labanoff's Appendix.
[3] Queen Mary's Letter—Keith, 332.
[4] Knox, Hist. Ref. Scot. Diurnal of Occurrents.
[5] Second Italian Memorial, in Labanoff's Appendix, vol. vii.

Queen "that the banished Lords had been sent for by the King, and would return on the morrow to take part with them against her." Mary significantly asked Ruthven, "what kindness there was between him and Moray?" for Moray had told his royal sister that Ruthven was a sorcerer, and endeavoured to persuade her to punish him for his *maleficiums;* and this was no secret to Ruthven, as the following dialogue shows: "Remember you," said she, "what the Earl of Moray would have had me do to you for giving me the ring?" Not being able to deny a fact which apparently was matter of notoriety, Ruthven answered "that he would bear no quarrel for that cause, but would forgive him and all others for God's sake; and as for that ring, it had no more virtue than another ring, but was a little ring with a pointed diamond in it."[1] This was the enchanted ring the Queen had spoken of to Knox. "Remember you not," said her Majesty, "that you said it had a virtue to keep me from poisoning?" "Liketh your Grace, I said so much that the ring had that virtue; but I take that evil opinion out of your head, of presupposition that you conceived the Protestants would have done, which he (Moray) knew the contrary, and that the Protestants would have done no more harm to your Majesty's body than to their own heart." Then said her Majesty to the Lord Ruthven, "What offence or default have I done to be thus handled?" "Inquire," said he, "of the King your husband." "Nay," said she, "I will inquire of you."[2] "Madam," said he, "if it would please your Majesty to remember that you have this long time a number of perverse persons, and especially David, a strange Italian, who hath ruled and guided the country without the advice of the nobility and Council, especially against those noblemen that were banished." "Were you not one of my Council?" replied Mary; "why would you not declare it, if I would do anything amiss?" "Because," he retorted, "your Majesty would hear no such thing in all the time your Majesty was at Glasgow and Dumfries," (the time of her triumphant career against the rebels); "but, when you called your

[1] Ruthven and Morton's Narrative—Keith's Appendix. [2] Ibid.

Council together, did things by yourself and your privy persons, albeit your nobility be at the pains and expenses." "Well," said her Majesty, "you find great fault with me. I will be content to set down my crown before the Lords of the Articles, and if they find that I have offended, to set it down where they please."[1] A discussion on the subject of the Lords of the Articles followed, Darnley taking no part in the conversation, and Mary continuing to weep. At last, from utter faintness and exhaustion, she became incapable of utterance; and Ruthven, observing that she was very ill, told Darnley they had better leave her to take some repose, which accordingly they did, but under a strict guard.[2]

"All that night," continues Mary, "we were detained in captivity within our chamber, not permitting us to have intercommuned scarcely with our servant-women nor domestic serviters!"[3] What a night it was for her in that unpurified chamber, the very air of which had been polluted by her rude invaders; she passed it in delirious agony.[4] "The next morning being Sunday," says Sir James Melville, "I was letten forth of the gates, for I lay therein. Passing through the outer close, the Queen's Majesty was looking forth of a window, and cried unto me to help her. Then I drew near unto the window, and asked 'what help lay in my power?' She said, 'Go to the Provost of Edinburgh, and bid him convene the town with speed, and come and release me out of these traitors' hands. But run fast,' said she, 'for they will stay you.' By [the time] this was said, one Master Nisbet, Master of the Household to the Earl of Lennox, was sent with a company to stay me, to whom I gave good words, and said 'I was only passing to the preaching at St Giles's Church,' for it was Sunday; but I went with speed to the Provost, and told him my commission from the Queen. The Provost (who had seen how unavailing his interference on the preceding night had been) said 'he wist not what to do,' and that 'he

[1] Ruthven and Morton's Narrative—Keith's Appendix. [2] Ibid.
[3] Queen Mary's Letter to the Archbishop of Glasgow.
[4] Diurnal of Occurrents.

had received a 'command from the King to convene the people at the Tolbooth to see what they would do,' and this he did; but no resolution was taken, which I sent," continues Melville, "and showed to her Majesty by one of her ladies."[1] Darnley had, in the mean time, ordered proclamation to be made at the Market Cross, "that none of the people, except Protestants, should be permitted to leave their houses," and commanded the Provost to arm a strong guard to enforce obedience. He also dissolved the Convention of the Three Estates of Scotland assembled in Parliament, in his own name and by his own authority, enjoining, in the most arbitrary language, all the members of that National Assembly to "depart Edinburgh within three hours, under pain of loss of life, lands, and goods, except only such as the King by his special command caused to remain."[2] This was kinging it in a more despotic style than even his burly uncle Henry VIII. had ever ventured to attempt in England, and afforded ample reason for Mary's prudential reluctance to confide the reins of the chariot of state to the rash guidance of her ambitious Phæton.

The distress of the poor Queen is thus touchingly recorded by the pen of one of her subjects in a quaint contemporary diary:[3] "Our Sovereign Lady took such dolour and displeasure for committing the said slaughter in her presence by her husband and the complices foresaid so shamefully, that she was in danger and peril of parting with her child, wherewith she was very great. Nevertheless she was holden in captivity within her chamber, that no person nor persons might come and speak with her but those whom they pleased." Even when Darnley, whose heart began to smite him for his barbarous misconduct on the preceding evening, sent his English Master of the Horse, Sir William Standen, to inquire after her health, and to comfort her, his messenger was not allowed to enter, nor were any of his servants permitted to pass through the guards stationed at her Majesty's chamber-

[1] Sir James Melville's Memoirs.

[2] Narrative of Ruthven and Morton. Keith; Chalmers; Tytler. Labanoff's Appendix.

[3] Diurnal of Occurrents.

door, without an express order from the rebel Lords who had placed her person under restraint.[1] Startled at this insolent prohibition, Darnley determined to visit his captive consort himself. He found her in her desolate chamber unattended, and in a state of delirious agony, full of terror lest Ruthven should break in and murder her. She besought him to let her ladies come to her. Darnley, in promising to accord this favour, engaged for more than he could perform without obtaining the permission of Ruthven and Morton, whose puppet he had now rendered himself; and they seriously objected to any such concession, representing "that it would be extremely hazardous, as they feared the Queen would be able, through her ladies, to communicate with her nobles:" but as he had passed his word, and insisted it should be so, they at last affected to consent.[2] The ladies were, however, either intimidated or denied access to the Queen's chamber. Several hours later, when Darnley, after he had taken his own dinner, returned to visit his lonely captive consort, he found her in increased distress of mind and body, and complaining piteously "that she could not get any of her ladies, either Scotch or French, to come to her." Darnley, beginning to grow uneasy at the sad state to which he saw her reduced, sent word to Ruthven and Morton "that it was his pleasure that the Queen's ladies should be allowed to come to her assistance."[3] Leal and true they were to their royal mistress in her hour of need, and perfectly ready, as the traitors suspected, to do their best to serve her, and circumvent those who were thus barbarously misusing her. Mary derived hope as well as comfort from their feminine sympathy and hearty co-operation in her projects for her deliverance. In the first place, she was able, through Mary Livingstone's agency, to employ John Sempill, the husband of that lady, to bring to her from David Riccio's chamber, which was placed under his father's jurisdiction by the confederates, the black box containing her secret foreign correspondence, and the keys of her various ciphers—a matter

[1] Lord Herries' History of Queen Mary.
[2] Ruthven and Morton's Narrative—Keith's Appendix. [3] Ibid.

of the greatest importance. Next, with the assistance of this fair and zealous band of secretaries, the royal captive indited and sent forth letters to her ministers of state, the Earls of Atholl, Argyll, Bothwell, and many others.[1] She also employed one of her ladies to arrange with Sir James Melville, that he should do his best to propitiate his friend and patron Moray on his arrival, and bring him at once to her.[2] She contrived, at the same time, to communicate to Arthur Erskine, and others of her faithful servants, her intention to attempt her escape, and pass to Seton House.

Ruthven and his people kept, meantime, a watchful eye on the Queen and her devoted female band; and having learned that she had formed a design of stealing out of her chamber among a party of her ladies, closely screened in hoods and mufflers, he came to impart the same to her husband. Darnley on this placed a guard at her door, with orders to let no one pass out muffled; but he was presently informed "that the ladies paid no attention to his decree, for that they would not pass out of the Queen's chamber unmuffled."[3] He then went to bear her company, that he might himself watch her movements; but she was apparently in no state for the enterprises described by Ruthven. At his coming down to his own chamber, Darnley confided to his dictatorial counsellors, Ruthven and Morton, all that had passed between him and his royal wife, whom he had so effectually soothed that she had granted that he should pass the night with her. They greatly censured his manner of proceeding with her,[4] nothing being more ominous to them than the prospect of a reconciliation between the unfortunate pair, whom they had, as they fancied, converted into deadly foes to each other. It was considered expedient to introduce a debate on the concession of the crown-matrimonial, (that fatal apple of discord, which had first produced jealousy and distrust,) as the most likely means of preventing scenes of impassioned penitence

[1] Ruthven and Morton's Narrative—Keith's Appendix.
[2] Sir James Melville's Memoirs.
[3] Ruthven and Morton's Narrative—Keith's Appendix.
[4] Ibid.

and relenting love. Morton said "it was necessary that he, as Lord-Chancellor, should confer with the Queen on the subject, and also that of the return of the banished Lords." Mary condescended to grant the audience, which, under her circumstances, she had no power to refuse. On entering her chamber he said "that he had not come to ask pardon in the case of David, seeing he was wholly innocent of his slaughter, but to inquire her pleasure about the Estates of Parliament, and whether she meant to deny the crown-matrimonial to her husband."[1] "My cousin," replied the Queen, who always graciously acknowledged the claims of Darnley's kindred, in like manner as if they had been in the same degree of relationship to herself, "I have never refused to honour my husband to the utmost of my power, and since I have espoused him I have continually procured for him everything I could for his aggrandisement; but the persons to whom the King now gives his confidence are those who have always dissuaded me from it,"—the foremost of these having been Morton himself, who had always represented to his royal mistress "the danger of trusting a person of her husband's unfortunate temper with more power, and that, if she did not hold the reins with a firm hand, he would ruin both himself and her." To this implied reproach the perfidious minister coolly replied, by urging her to do what was required of her; but Mary prudently observed, "that as she was a prisoner, all she might do would be invalid, and foreign Princes would say that her subjects had given laws to their Sovereign—an example very improper to establish."[2]

[1] Second Italian Memorial—Labanoff's Appendix. [2] Ibid.

MARY STUART

CHAPTER XXII.

SUMMARY

Queen Mary's doleful Sunday in captivity—Arrival of Moray and the other exiled Lords—She sends for Moray—Her touching greeting—Fancies him her friend—His cruel counsel for her death—Darnley comes to the Queen—Her pathetic appeal to him—Their reconciliation—Dangerous state of the Queen's health—Darnley requires the Lords to remove the guards—They demur—Mary confers with Lethington—He advises her to see the conspirators, and talk with them—She promises to pardon them—Darnley outwits the conspirators, and contrives Mary's escape—He carries her off from Holyrood—Their midnight flitting—Reach Seton House in safety—Arrive at Dunbar—Early breakfast—Queen's first attempt at cooking—She writes to her friends—Loyal affection of her people—The rebel league splits—Mary refuses to forgive Lennox—Fresh discord between her and Darnley—They come to Haddington—Queen pardons Moray and his confederates—Moray's treachery—Queen's triumphant return to Edinburgh—Her clemency—Darnley's desire to have the rebels punished—Domestic infelicity of the Queen—She desires to go to France—Darnley leaves her—He receives absolution, and returns—She goes to Edinburgh Castle—Council decide she must lie in there—Encounters the Earl of Arran—Her kindness to him—She remonstrates with Queen Elizabeth for receiving Morton and the conspirators—Mary tries to reconcile the quarrelsome nobles—Forgives divers traitors—Darnley's displeasure—She takes Joseph Riccio into her service—Provides Christian burial for the remains of David Riccio—Her depression of spirits—Darnley retires from Edinburgh Castle to Holyrood Abbey.

No Sabbath rest was there for the captive Sovereign in her sternly guarded chamber. On the afternoon of that memorable Sunday, March 10th, new and important actors appeared on the scene. The Earl of Moray and the other banished Lords arrived in Edinburgh, escorted by a thousand horsemen under the command of Lord Home. They pro-

ceeded straight to the Hall of Parliament, as if in obedience to their summons. They found it gaily decorated and hung with tapestry,[1] just as it had been dressed in honour of the Queen's visit on the preceding Thursday, when she opened the Sessions. But the benches were empty; for the usurping Monarch of the day having commenced his reign by ordering all the representatives of the Three Estates out of Edinburgh that morning, with as little ceremony as if they had been a troop of vagabonds, they had vacated their places in consternation, and departed. Moray and his companions next presented themselves at the Abbey gates. They were frankly admitted, and graciously received by Darnley, who had recalled them, and promised full remission, in his own name, for their treasons.[2] As soon as the Queen heard of Moray's arrival, she sent a private message through one of her ladies requiring him to come to her. He obeyed her summons, and appeared shocked and surprised at the doleful condition in which he found her. Mary flung herself into his arms with an impassioned burst of feeling, kissed and embraced him many times, exclaiming at the same time, in the simplicity of her heart, "Oh, my brother! if you had been here, you never would have allowed me to be so cruelly handled."[3] Tears fell from Moray's eyes at this tender and pathetic greeting from his royal sister. "He knew also," observes Melville, "that it was not for his sake, but for their own particular interests, that all this had been done." Moray was too well acquainted with his brethren in iniquity to be as easily deceived by their smiles as his royal sister was by his tears. Little did poor Mary suspect that his name stood foremost in the bond of association for the murder of Riccio, for bestowing the crown of Scotland on her husband, consigning herself to prison, and, if expediency prompted, to death.

She told Moray "it was no fault of hers that he had been so long away, for it was well known she would have restored him long ago, but for displeasing others."[4] And

[1] Knox, History of the Reformation in Scotland.
[2] Narrative of Ruthven and Morton. [3] Melville's Memoirs.
[4] Randolph and Bedford to Cecil. Ellis's Royal Letters. Wright.

this was in allusion to Darnley's petulant opposition to the act of grace she would, in accordance with the clemency of her disposition, have extended to Moray and the other exiles, after she had, by Riccio's prudent counsel, granted a remission to the Duke of Châtelherault.[1] Those writers who have so severely censured Mary for not restoring Moray, Rothes, and the others, should remember that, as they had conspired against her husband's life, she could not in common decency allow them to return to Scotland against his consent. What would have been said of her if she had? But now that Darnley had thought proper to recall them on his own authority, and in her despite, she told Moray "he was welcome, and promised, if he would return to his allegiance and be a good subject, she would be to him all he could require."[2] Moray, in reply, "protested his innocence of ever having entertained evil intentions against her,"—the misconduct of Darnley naturally disposing her to regard those who had endeavoured to prevent her marriage with him as her best advisers.

Mary besought her brother's assistance in restoring her to her liberty and regal authority. He assured her he had no power to do so, but made deceitful professions of his compassion for her sufferings and his good-will.[3] Mary gave him credit for sincerity, for she records that Moray, "seeing her state and condition, was moved with natural affection towards her."[4] What strong delusion possessed this unfortunate Princess that she could believe so, in the face of the facts she thus goes on to state? "Upon the morn he assembled the enterprisers of this late crime, and such of our rebels as came with him. In their council they thought it most expedient we should be warded in our Castle of Stirling, there to remain till we had approved in Parliament all their wicked enterprises, established their religion, and given to the King the crown-matrimonial, or else by all appearance firmly purposed to

[1] Robertson. Chalmers.
[2] Randolph and Bedford to Cecil, March 27. Ellis.
[3] Fairbairn's Life of Mary Stuart. Guilbert de Bois le Pesant. Lord Herries' History of Queen Mary.
[4] Queen Mary's Letter to the Archbishop of Glasgow. Keith.

have put us to death."[1] So much for the workings of the natural affection with which the heart of the fraternal sympathiser, Moray, was moved towards his royal sister in her desolation! At this council her worthy father-in-law, the Earl of Lennox, assisted.[2] Lennox, though one of the great inciters of the plot, had prudently kept out of sight till the overt and responsible acts of treason—the slaughter of David Riccio in the presence of the pregnant Queen, and her arrest—had been achieved. He appears to have returned from England either with Moray and his associates, or as their harbinger. A more select conclave, confined to Moray's especial confederates, had met, however, on the Sunday evening at Morton's house, to take their resolution on the momentous question of Mary's life or death. This being referred to Moray's decision, when he came from his royal sister's prison-room, with his cheeks still moistened with the tears they had wept together, as she clung to him in her agonising welcome of confiding fondness, he coolly pronounced his veto for her death, by declaring his opinion to Morton and the actual assassins of Riccio, "that they had gone too far to recede with safety, for they could expect no grace from the Queen; therefore it behoved them to take such measures as the laws of self-preservation prescribed. And even if it were possible for a princess of her high spirit to forgive such an outrage, there could be no security for their religion (*ergo*, their church-land appropriations) if she were restored to her regal authority."[3]

There was a debate among the doomsters of their Sovereign as to the term of days that should be permitted her; for it was, by the more prudent as well as the most merciful of the party, proposed that she should be removed to some stricter place of confinement, and there kept securely till after the birth of the infant heir of the Crown, in whose name they might govern under the title of a Council of Regency. Moray replied "that delays were dangerous;

[1] Queen's Letter to Beton, Archbishop of Glasgow.
[2] Adam Blackwood's Life of Queen Mary. Tytler, Hist. Scot. Keith.
[3] Ibid.—Maitland Club edition.

they had involved themselves in a perilous dilemma, and it was no time to dally."[1] These discussions were not for Darnley's ear. He had, however, heard and seen enough to convince him of his folly. His instinctive hatred to Moray, which had been stifled, not extinguished, by their unnatural political alliance, broke out again on perceiving that person was treated with much greater respect than himself by the conspirators, and that he had had a private interview with the Queen, without either asking his permission or informing him of the nature of their conference. Moray, within an hour after his return to Edinburgh, sufficiently demonstrated who the real head of the party was, for whose exaltation the revolution was projected, that had hurled the lawful Sovereign from her throne, while to her deluded husband would be assigned the odium of her murder, and its punishment.

While the verdict for the life or death of Mary Stuart and the unborn heir of the Britannic empire was yet under the consideration of the junta assembled in Morton's house, Darnley, conscience-stricken at the things he had done, and terrified at the prospect of the still more atrocious designs to which he apprehended he might be rendered an accomplice, sought the chamber of his injured consort, his only refuge from the mocking fiends with whom he had conspired against her.

Mary, who had determined to make a last powerful appeal to the feelings of her husband, rose, advanced to meet him, and with mournful earnestness addressed him in these words: "Alas, Sir! and wherefore is it thus that you requite me for having loved you above all the men in the world? Why is it that you have torn yourself from my love, to enleague yourself with our mutual foes—at this time, too, when I am likely to bring you a child to the increase of your credit and importance? But, alas! by these violent proceedings you will destroy both mother and child; and when you have done this, you will perceive, too late, the motives of those who have tempted you to this wickedness. Think not you will escape from their bloody hands,

[1] Adam Blackwood's Life of Queen Mary—Maitland Club edition.

after they have caused you to slay what ought to be so dear to you; for you will be overwhelmed in my ruins, having no other hold on the realm of Scotland but what you derive from me."[1] Her tears and pathetic eloquence prevailed; Darnley threw himself at her feet, and in an agony of remorse besought her to forgive his crime, and restore him to her love, offering, at the same time, to do anything she desired. To Mary's honour it is recorded, that her first injunction was dictated by her anxiety for the weal of his immortal soul, stained with the deadly guilt of murder. She knew his life was in no less danger than her own, and therefore begged him, "above all things, to endeavour to appease the wrath of God by penitence and prayer, that he might obtain forgiveness where it was most requisite to seek for mercy.[2] As for her own forgiveness, that she most frankly accorded," she said, turning upon him as she spoke, her face beaming with tenderness and joy. Darnley now relieved his burdened mind by revealing the unaccomplished design of the conspirators, "to hang Sir James Balfour at her chamber-door; to behead the Earls of Bothwell, Huntley, and Livingstone"—all four Protestants, be it remembered—"and to drown certain of her faithful ladies. Her own life," he added, "was, he feared, in danger, unless she could find some means of effecting her escape."[3] Mary confided to him that arrangements had been made for that purpose by the Earls of Huntley and Bothwell, who, since their escape, had found means to let her know that they had prepared ropes, which they would send secretly to her, together with the apparatus for letting her down in a chair outside the palace, where she would be received by them, and escorted to a safe refuge—the only place whence it was possible for her to make the descent being the clock-tower. But Darnley earnestly dissuaded her from such an enterprise, as too hazardous to be attempted by any woman, especially one in her situation. Mary, with her characteristic courage, would have risked the descent nevertheless, if her husband had not prevented it, and promised to find

[1] Adam Blackwood. Caussin's Life of Mary. [2] Caussin.
[3] Italian Memorial, in Labanoff's Appendix and Tytler's Appendix.

some safer means for her enfranchisement.[1] As an earnest of his good intentions, Darnley essayed to dismiss four-and-twenty men-at-arms who were keeping guard at Mary's chamber-door, but found he had no power to enforce obedience to his commands. He was, in fact, as much a prisoner within the walls of the palace of Holyrood as his consort, though with a tether somewhat more extended, as he was able to pass from his own apartments to her chamber; but how long that liberty might last appeared doubtful. Mary had enjoined him to conceal their reconciliation, and to make the most of her illness; yet the yearning of his heart towards her was observed, and excited the sarcasms of Ruthven and Morton. According to their report, "the King grew effeminate again, and they said to him, 'We see no other but you may do what both you and we will have cause to repent;' nevertheless he would have the house ridded, conformably to her Majesty's wish."[2]

Darnley's purpose of returning to his royal wife's bed-chamber that night was frustrated by a fit of drowsiness, so unseasonable that it can only be accounted for by the conjecture, that either he had drunk to excess, or his wine had been drugged with a strong opiate by the parties who had testified their disapproval of his conjugal appointment. The latter circumstance is rendered the more suspicious by the fact that his worthy uncles, George the Postulate and the occult Ruthven, kept their watch and ward in his wardrobe that night.[3] Darnley awoke not from his lethargic slumbers till six o'clock on the following morning (Monday, the 11th of March.)[4] Ruthven sarcastically inquired "wherefore he had not kept his tryst with the Queen?" He answered, "that he had fallen into a dead sleep," and blamed his confidential servant, William Elder, "for not awaking him." "Several attempts" were stated "to have been made for that purpose, but it was impossible to rouse him from his stupefaction." He then said "he would go to the Queen immediately, and offer his excuses." Ruthven treated the idea with deri-

[1] Teulet's Pièces et Documens relatifs des Affairs d'Escosses, vol. ii.
[2] Morton and Ruthven's Narrative.
[3] Ruthven and Morton's Narrative—Keith's Appendix. [4] Ibid.

sion, predicting that she would receive him with coldness and disdain; but Darnley was not to be deterred from visiting her.[1]

Mary, who had spent another restless night in an agony of suspense and disappointed hope, closed her tear-swollen eyes at his approach, and feigned to be asleep. Darnley seated himself on the side of her bed, and remained for the space of an hour silently regarding her. At last she spoke; it was to inquire "why he came not up to her the night before?" Darnley alleged, in excuse, "the dead sleep into which he had unluckily fallen;" being greatly out of humour, he added a torrent of reproaches because Mary said "she was ill," and did not welcome him, now he had favoured her with his presence. Instead of chafing his irascible temper with angry rejoinders, Mary said "she would rise;" but he had much to say to her on matters of deep importance to them both; and when his petulance subsided, he represented to her the necessity of her promising to grant an amnesty not only to the banished Earls, but also to those who had been concerned in the slaughter of her Secretary. Mary listened quiescently, and said "she would be guided by his advice." Much elated at this, he returned to his own apartments, and merrily related all that had passed. Morton and Ruthven listened with uneasiness to this evidence of renewed amity between the royal pair. They endeavoured to inspire Darnley with distrust of his consort's sincerity. "It is all words," said they, "and instead of your persuading her, we fear she will persuade you to her desire; for she has been trained up in the Court of France."[2] "Now," rejoined he, "will you let me alone? and I will warrant to bring all to a good end."

At nine o'clock, having made his state toilet, Darnley returned to the Queen's chamber, where, being alone, they reasoned together, and took counsel of each other, as earnestly as if the familiar confidence of conjugal affection had never been interrupted.[3] Darnley entreated the Queen to appear resigned to her present irksome situation, to refrain

[1] Ruthven and Morton's Narrative—Keith's Appendix. [2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid. Italian Memorial in Labanoff.

from sharp words, and to sign and promise everything the conspirators demanded, for they would keep her strictly warded till she did; but being once restored to her liberty, she could revoke all that she had been constrained by fear to do. He remained with her till two o'clock in the afternoon, at which unusually late hour he descended to take his dinner in his own apartments: he then declared to Moray, Morton, Ruthven, and Lindsay, "that he had prevailed on the Queen to grant them presence, and to forgive all their offences, which she would dismiss from her mind as though they had never been." "Fair speaking is but policy," they replied, "and such promises would never be performed."[1] Darnley bade them make what security they pleased, and he would join her Majesty in subscribing it. After he had dined he passed again to the Queen's apartments, but the midwife came to him with the alarming tidings "that her Majesty was in danger of a premature confinement, and very disastrous consequences could not fail of following from her present symptoms, unless she could be removed to some place where she had freer air." Several of her ladies confirmed this report, whereupon he returned to his chamber at three o'clock, to declare the same to the Lords. Then came the Queen's French doctor, and assured the youthful husband, in their presence, "that her Majesty was very ill, and unless she were removed from that place to some sweeter, pleasanter air, she could not possibly eschew a fever, and repeated the prediction of the good ladies above. Darnley asked the Lords what they thought of the doctor's report? They said, "they feared it was but craft and policy." In the course of the discussion Darnley emphatically declared "that the Queen was a true Princess, and he would set his life for what she promised."[2] Would the royal husband, it may be asked, have volunteered such an assertion, if there had been the slightest foundation for the gross slanders of Buchanan, charging Mary with conjugal infidelity, which must neces-

[1] Ruthven and Morton's Narrative.

[2] Ibid. The incident above related about the midwife rests solely on the authority of Ruthven and Morton, and is mentioned by no one else.

sarily involve a system of falsehood both of word and deed?

Between four and five o'clock the same afternoon Darnley passed to the Queen, and took the Earls of Morton and Moray and the Lord Ruthven with him. Leaving them in the outer chamber, he went in and inquired if her Majesty would come into the outer chamber, or allow the Lords to enter? Mary, submitting herself entirely to her husband's direction, permitted him to lead her into the outer chamber. The Earls and Lord Ruthven knelt and made a general address to her by the Earl of Morton her Lord-Chancellor, and then each said something for himself, promising obedience, and to demean themselves as good subjects in time to come.[1] When the Queen had heard all, she replied "that the Lords knew that she was never bloodthirsty, nor greedy of their lands or goods, since her coming into Scotland, nor would be upon theirs that were present; then, signifying 'her intention to accord her grace to them and the other offenders,' and bidding them rise, she told them 'to prepare their own securities, and she would subscribe them.' Then her Majesty took the King by the hand, and, giving her other to the Earl of Moray, she walked between them in the outer chamber for about an hour, and so passed into her bedroom, where she and the King appointed that all who came on his part"—in other words, those who had drawn him into a treasonable confederacy to murder her servants and dethrone her, and were then keeping her as a prisoner in her own palace—"should depart in peace, and leave her and him at liberty."[2] But this was no part of the intentions of the perfidious men, who, after labouring successfully to create jealousy and strife between the royal pair, had entered their strong places, and meant to divide their spoils. They had seized the palace of Holyrood, and occupied it with an armed force, and imprisoned the Queen under the pretext that she had wronged her husband. But her husband and she had come to a right understanding;

[1] Ruthven and Morton's Narrative — Keith's Appendix. Tytler. Robertson.

[2] Randolph and Bedford to Cecil, March 27, 1565-6—Robertson's Appendix.

he had assured these perilous go-betweens "that she was a true Princess, and he would set his life on her integrity;" that he had no longer any occasion for their lordships' presence, and desired to be freed from the intrusion of the guards they had set over his royal consort. Yet they objected to his requisition, and, by their resistance to a request so lawful and reasonable, reduced him to the degrading necessity of practising, and tutoring the Queen to unite with him in practising, every kind of subterfuge and artifice to carry the point, in order to escape from the illegal and alarming thraldom in which both were kept. Mary has been severely blamed by some of her biographers "for the dissimulation used by her on this occasion," as if sincerity were due to the perfidious traitors who had carried on a conspiracy against her life and government, committed a dastardly assassination in her presence, and treated her with personal brutality, unexampled in the annals of a Christian country. But the evidence even of the assassins proves that their friend Darnley, whom they had previously tutored to deceive Mary, was the contriver of the counter-plot for outwitting them; that the Queen, being assuredly at that time a prisoner under marital control, did everything he enjoined as the price of her deliverance from chains and death, as any other woman would have done under the like circumstances. To Darnley, therefore, is due the whole credit of extricating his consort and himself at the same time from the frightful predicament in which his consummate folly had placed them.

While he went down to supper, which was at six o'clock, and kept the Lords in talk about their securities, his trusty English Master of the Horse, Sir William Standen (either father or elder brother to the gallant young page Anthony, who had turned aside the murderous dagger of Patrick Bellenden from the bosom of the Queen), waited on her Majesty to arrange with her the hour and manner in which she thought of attempting her escape. By his advice and diligence horses were prepared and the time appointed with the

King.[1] The only remaining difficulty was to remove the guards. The King again proposed it to the Lords when they brought their securities to him for the Queen's signature and his own; but they still demurred, observing, "You may do what you please, but it is sore against our wills; for we fear that all is deceit that is meant towards us, and that the Queen will pass away shortly, and take you with her, either to the Castle of Edinburgh or Dunbar."[2] As wherefore, it may be asked, should she not, being the Sovereign of the realm, with so lawful a companion as her husband? But neither was their Sovereign free to take that change of air which her physician had prescribed, nor her husband to travel in her company, though Morton and Ruthven had told him "he could do what he pleased."[3] Now his Majesty, having a pretty strong will of his own, desired to rid his palace of their presence, and his consort's antechamber of their men-at-arms, and found he could not do it.[4] What were that poor little man David Riccio's offences, in comparison with insolence like this? Fortunately, and for a wonder, Darnley kept his temper, and had his father to back him in his desire of passing the night with the Queen, or he might have been circumvented in that also; for Lennox, having his eye on the grant of the crown-matrimonial to his son, and the succession for himself, pleaded, "that the best and only way of managing the Queen was through the power of her affections, and therefore it would be desirable that his son should affect great fondness for her."[5] Yet Darnley had been too prudent to trust his father with the secret of the full, perfect, and entire reconciliation between himself and Mary, much less with his chivalric intention of effecting her deliverance that night, in case they could get rid of the guards.

In this dilemma Mary sent for Lethington. Deep-dyed in the conspiracy though he were, he had not outraged her womanly feelings by brandishing a murderous weapon in her presence, nor coming before her with the stains of murder

[1] Lord Herries. Fragmentary History of Mary Queen of Scots, edited by Pitcairn, and privately printed by the Abbotsford Club.
[2] Ruthven and Morton's Narrative. [3] Ibid.
[4] Second Italian Memorial, in Labanoff's Appendix. [5] Ibid.

on his hands and dress to taunt her like the coarser-minded ruffians of the confederacy, who played the butchers' part in the tragedy; he was not, therefore, an object of horror to her, so she gave him gentle words, and condescended to entreat his aid in negotiating with the other Lords for the dismissal of the guards. He undertook to do his best for her satisfaction, and found many were willing it should be done, if they could be sure of their remission.[1] As she had condescended to see Morton and Moray, she was advised to see them all, and speak to them herself in presence of the King and each other. The particulars of this conference are thus recorded by an impartial contemporary authority: "And all the 11th of March 1565–6, our Sovereign Lady was holden in captivity within her chamber in Holyrood House till even; and at even it was convened between our said Sovereign Lady and all the Lords, committers of the slaughter, except my Lord Ruthven (whom she would not allow to come in her presence, because he was the principal man that came in her cabinet to commit the said slaughter), and with all the remaining Lords banished before, as said is, that her Majesty would give them remission for all crimes bygone, unto the said eleventh day; and 'albeit she would subscribe their remission instantly,' she said, 'because she was holden in captivity, it would do them no good;' and to satisfy them more pleasantly, she said 'she would pass the morn, God willing, to the Tolbooth, and there, by consent of Parliament, make an act of remission to them for the crimes above written;' and this said, she drank to every one of them in special."[2] This was apparently the cup of peace, without which no reconciliation could be cemented in Scotland, any more than among the North American Indians, without the introduction of the pipe and a few friendly whiffs.

The Queen having promised this formal remission—which was all they could require of her as a condition for removing the restraint under which they presumed, against her husband's consent, to keep her—she requested them "to

[1] Letter of Randolph and Bedford to Cecil, March 27. Wright's Elizabeth.
[2] Diurnal of Occurrents in Scotland, p. 92.

deliver the keys of her palace to her servants, and leave her chamber to the care of her own officials, the same as it was wont to be, because for the last two nights she had taken no rest." The King facetiously promised "to be her keeper himself for that night, and to take very good care of her, if so be they would rid the palace of strangers, and trust her in his hands." He also showed them that she was now so ill and exhausted that she could hardly stand for bodily weakness, and was therefore in no plight for nocturnal enterprises.[1] "To avoid them of our palace, with their guard and assisters," says the Queen, "the King promised to keep us that night in sure guard, and that, without compulsion, he should cause us in Parliament approve all their conspiracies. By this *moyen* he caused them to retire them of our palace." The reluctancy with which they withdrew is avowed by the assassins themselves in their narrative: "And the Lord Ruthven protested, 'that whatever bloodshed or mischief should ensue thereupon, should fall upon the King's head and his posterity.'" This maledictory invocation of the sorcerer Lord was subsequently quoted by his faction as a prediction; but evil prophecies seldom proceed from the inspiration of the Author of good; and though Ruthven lived not to assist in the fulfilment of his denunciation of the dark doom that awaited the unfortunate Darnley, his cousin Morton, the joint author of the narrative, was only too deeply interested in bringing it to pass.[2]

Darnley heard the imprecation with indifference, and gaily answered, "He would warrant them all." So they parted, and passed from the Palace of Holyrood to the Earl of Morton's house, where they supped, not placing the slightest reliance on the extorted promises of the Queen, far less on the professions of Darnley, but supposing it physically impossible for her to make any personal effort after two sleepless nights and days of agonising excitement. They had yet to learn the energies of the mind which animated that form, "so soft and fair," and enabled Mary Stuart

[1] Blackwood's Life of Queen Mary. Lord Herries. Italian Memorials in Labanoff's Appendix.

[2] Morton's Confession, in Bannatyne's Memorials.

courageously to strive against the rough currents of her adverse fate.

In order to avoid suspicion, their Majesties both went to bed, but rose two hours after midnight; the Queen being only attended by one faithful maid, who is supposed to have been Margaret Carwood (or Cawood), for Bastian,[1] whom she afterwards married, was also an assistant in the enterprise, and gave the proper signal when all was ready. They stealthily descended a secret stair to a postern leading through the cemetery of the Chapel-royal. At the outer gate of the cemetery Sir William Standen was waiting with the King's horse, he being the only person in his household whom he ventured to take with him. The Queen was with some difficulty, and at the danger of her life, we are told, lifted up behind Arthur Erskine, her equerry, the hereditary shield-bearer to the Sovereign of Scotland—he being mounted on a fleet palfrey, provided with a pillion for her use. Lord Traquair, the Captain of the Guard, took her maid, Margaret, behind him. Sir William Standen and Bastian rode singly. The little cavalcade—seven persons, with five horses only—cleared the precincts of the palace unperceived, under the shadow of night, and arrived safely at Seton House, their first and only resting-place. Lord Seton, apprised of their intentions, was in readiness, with two hundred armed cavaliers, to receive his fugitive Sovereign and her consort, and escort them on their journey to Dunbar.[2]

Mary's spirits rose with the excitement of the adventure and its successful progress. Invigorated by the fresh air and exercise, she insisted on taking a horse to herself, and was not only able to support herself in the saddle,[3] but performed the last twelve miles of the long sharp journey with such speed, that she and her company arrived at Dunbar before sunrise, and demanded admittance to her royal fortress. The warder's challenge was answered by the startling announcement, "Their Majesties the King and Queen!" Four-and-twenty hours had scarcely elapsed

[1] Lord Herries' History of Queen Mary. Labanoff's Appendix.
[2] Ibid. Labanoff's Appendix, vol. vii.
[3] Ibid. Bedford and Randolph to Cecil.

since Moray and the rebel Lords swept past those towers, on their triumphant return to Edinburgh, escorted by a thousand traitor spears, proclaiming through the country the tidings "that Holyrood Abbey was occupied by their confederates, that the Secretary was slain, and the Queen a prisoner in her husband's keeping, who meant to dethrone her;" and now the royal pair had eloped together, and were riding side by side, like errant lovers. The whole thing appeared so strange to the warder that he ventured not to raise the portcullis till he had ascertained how the castellan stood affected.[1] Now it happened that the castellan was not within the castle, but sleeping in a house hard by. Thither the warder ran to notify the names and rank of his early visitors, and to inquire whether they might be admitted, leaving his fair liege lady and her fiery young consort, with their faithful followers, waiting before the gates of the wave-beaten fortress in the bleak morning air, after their midnight flitting and hard ride of twenty miles. The pause, however brief, must have been an anxious one to the royal fugitives, knowing how full of treason were the times, and the demeanour of the warder not such as might have been expected. Their suspense was quickly over; the castellan instantly hastened to receive their Majesties with proper demonstrations of respect, and admitted them and all their company into the castle hall. "The first thing the Queen did was to order a fire to be made, to warm her, and asked for some new-laid eggs."

What will the dull generalisers, who declaim about the dignity of history, say to the graphic minuteness of such details?—but our lively Italian authority, we are happy to be able for the benefit of our readers to add, disdains not to record the pleasant fact that, "when the said eggs were brought to the Queen of Scotland, she herself put them on the fire to cook."[2] How Mary and Darnley must have enjoyed that early breakfast, after their twenty miles' race for life along the East Lothian coast, in the sharp air of a March morning! Small appetite for food could either of

[1] Memorial on Scotch Affairs, addressed to Cosmo de Medicis—Labanoff's Appendix, vol. vii. [2] Ibid.

them have had during the last dreadful eight-and-forty hours they spent in their palace of Holyrood.

As soon as Mary had refreshed herself with her simple repast in the hall of Dunbar Castle, she sat down to write to her royal brother-in-law, Charles IX. of France, and the Queen-mother, and also to her uncle, Cardinal de Lorraine, an account of the troubles that had befallen her. In her letter to her uncle the Cardinal she subscribed herself, "Your niece, Marie, Queen without a kingdom."[1] These letters the Queen despatched by the master of a small vessel from the port of Dunbar. They are probably still in existence, either in the royal archives of France or among the family papers of the representatives of the house of Lorraine, and, if they should ever be discovered, will be found far more interesting than the official recital in the style royal indited by Mary in calmer moments to her ambassador at the Court of France.[2]

Mary was mistaken when she signed herself a Queen without a kingdom, for the hearts of her people were hers, and that very day arrived the Earls of Huntley and Bothwell, and others, to whom the secret of her intended retreat had been confided, at the head of a levy of thirteen hundred horsemen for her succour.[3] With all the energy proper to the representative of Bruce, Mary strained every nerve for the recovery of her rights. She wrote letters and issued proclamations, summoning all the true men of Scotland to rally in defence of the Crown; and nobly was her call responded to by the chivalry of the realm, for she had immediately an army at her command of eight thousand men,[4] with which, in case of need, she would have been able to take the field against the conspirators. There was no need of it; they were, as before, defeated without striking a stroke, save the fifty-six dagger-thrusts they had demonstrated their valour by plunging into the feeble misshapen body of the luckless little Italian Secretary. They were assassins, not warriors.

[1] Memorial on Scotch Affairs, addressed to Cosmo I., Duke of Tuscany —Labanoff's Appendix.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Mary's Letter to the Archbishop of Glasgow.
[4] Knox.

Great was the consternation of the conspirators the next morning on discovering the elopement of Mary and her consort; unspeakable their fury against Darnley, not only for having outwitted them, crafty as they were, but because he had given a practical contradiction to their slanders, and publicly vindicated the honour of the Queen by assuming his proper character as her lawful protector, and delivering her out of their wicked hands.[1]

The first movement of Moray and his company from England was to present themselves in the Parliament Hall in the Tolbooth, and to cause record to be made "that they had appeared on the day of summons, March 12, but no one had urged anything against them." Mr Robert Crichton, their Majesties' advocate, being present, reminded them "that the Parliament had been discharged by the King on the tenth day of the month under pain of treason, therefore there was no Parliament sitting, and their proceedings were illegal and unavailing." A brave man must Mr Robert Crichton have been, but he was strong in the might of public opinion, which was for the Queen. Greatly had the conspirators been deceived by the representations of Knox and Randolph that Mary was hated and held in universal contempt by her subjects, the reverse being demonstrated by the loyal enthusiasm which animated all ranks in her favour. Her enemies found themselves, as before, in a very weak minority.[2] In this dilemma they despatched Lord Sempill with a humble supplication to her Majesty to sign their securities, and perform the other articles, according to her promise. Mary, not considering herself bound by any pledges extorted from her while a prisoner

[1] Knox, in perfect consistence with his hostility to womankind in general, and his fair Sovereign in particular, reviles Darnley by the epithet of "the uxorious King," for the performance of this, the only noble action of his life; and, instead of allowing him the credit due for contriving and successfully achieving the enfranchisement of the captive Queen, insists that she ran away with him, he "being allured by her sugared words" to go with her. Well would it have been for Darnley if he had really possessed the matrimonial complaisance with which he is reproached by the mutual enemies of himself and Mary; but he unhappily had a will of his own, which the weakness of his judgment rendered indomitable.

[2] Knox, Hist. Ref. Scot. Tytler; Chalmers; Keith.

in fear of her life, paid no attention to the envoy, whom she did not admit to her presence till the third day after his arrival at Dunbar, and then dismissed him with an unfavourable answer.[1] The rebel league now began to split, and every man sought to shift for himself. Glencairn was the first to abandon the confederacy: he hastened to Dunbar without a safe-conduct, and threw himself on the mercy of his offended Sovereign, protested his innocence of the late foul treason, and besought her pardon. Though Mary had considered his conduct so heinous that she had indignantly torn his petition when presented by his kinsmen and friends a few months previously, she now generously accorded her pardon, and accepted his personal submission.[2] The Earl of Rothes, who had commanded the ambush posted at the Parenwell to seize the Queen and assassinate Darnley, in the preceding June, was also, on making his personal submission and acknowledging his fault, forgiven—Mary having, with equal clemency and wisdom, determined to accord an amnesty to every one not personally implicated in the late outrageous act of cruelty and treason.

So strong was the Queen's party in Edinburgh at this time, that although the traitors were still in possession of the town, proclamation was made on the 15th of March at the Market Cross, "requiring, under pain of treason, the nobles, gentlemen, and substantial yeomen, with their servants and followers, to meet their Majesties at Musselburgh on Sunday, March 17, with weapons of war and eight days' provision, in readiness to perform such services as might be required." Intimation was also given that, if the rebel Lords were allowed to remain, Lord Erskine, the Governor of Edinburgh Castle, would be under the necessity of firing on the town. This judicious threat produced the expulsion of the whole of the conspirators and their accomplices: Morton, Ruthven, Lindsay, Kerr of Faudonside, George the Postulate, the ringleaders of the assassination, fled to England, and took possession of the quarters Moray and his company had previously occupied at New-

[1] Knox, Hist. Ref. Scot., Ruthven and Morton's Narrative.
[2] Queen Mary to Beton—Keith.

castle. Lethington retired to Dunkeld, and John Knox fled to Kyle.[1]

The Castle of Tantallon, which Darnley had resigned to Morton during their guilty confederacy, was now summoned in the name of their Majesties, and being surrendered, possession of this fortress and other appanages of Archibald, Earl of Angus, was resumed by the Crown.[2] Morton finally recovered the management of this vast inheritance for his nephew and ward, but not till after the formidable claims of the consort of Mary Stuart had been effectually exploded at the house of Kirk-of-Field.

Previously to his departure into England, Morton wrote to excuse himself to the Queen for his late acts of treason, assuring her he had been reluctantly drawn into complicity by the entreaties and threats of the King her husband, and his father, the Earl of Lennox, disclosing, at the same time, such evidences of the guilt of both that Mary forbade Lennox ever again to appear in her presence. This exclusion was very painful to Darnley, and affords ample explanation of the differences which, even before they left Dunbar, appear to have arisen between the royal pair.

After tarrying at Dunbar five days, they proceeded to

[1] It is much to be lamented that this eminent man should have allowed his headlong zeal to betray him into the following indisputable testimony of his approbation of the assassination of Riccio, and laudation of the persons by whom it was perpetrated: "That *pultron* and vile knave Davie," he observes, "was justly punished the ninth of March, in the year of God 1565-(6), for abusing of the commonwealth, and for his other villany, which we list not to express, by the counsel and hands of James Douglas, Earl of Morton, Patrick Lord Lindsay, and the Lord Ruthven, with other assisters in their company, who all, for their just act and most worthy of all praise, are now unworthily left of their brethren, and suffer the bitterness of banishment and exile."—Knox, Hist. Ref. Scot., vol. i. p. 235. This remarkable passage was penned by Knox during the exile of Morton and the other assassins of Riccio, but he adds a fervent prayer "that God will restore them to their country, and punish the head and tail that now trouble the just and maintain impiety." His marginal note explains that he is then predicting the fate of the Queen and her ministers in 1566. "The head," he observes, "is known; the tail has two branches—the temporal Lords that maintain her abominations, and her flattering counsellors, blasphemous Balfour, now called Clerk of Register, and Sinclair, Dean of Restalrig, blind of one eye, but of both in his soul, upon whom God shortly took vengeance."

[2] Diurnal of Occurrents. Robert Lauder of the Bass being appointed Captain of Tantallon by their Majesties.

Haddington, where they spent Sunday, March 17th, held a Court and Council, and transacted much important business, involving an entire change of Ministry. Morton was discharged from the office of Lord-Chancellor, and the seals bestowed on the Earl of Huntley. Sir James Balfour, the Protestant parson of Fliske, was made Clerk-Register in the place of the traitor James Makgill—always a secret-service man of England, and now a convicted accomplice in the conspiracy against the Queen. Lethington, and Bellenden the Justice-Clerk, who were not personally assisting in the butchery of Riccio, had conducted themselves with such profound caution that their complicity could not have been proved if it had not been denounced by Darnley, who took a bitter satisfaction in the exposure and punishment of his tempters and confederates in evil. Lethington was stripped of the rich abbacy of Haddington, the Queen's misapplied bounty. This she now transferred to the Earl of Bothwell, whose ancestors, the Lords of Hailes, were the original patrons of the abbey, and whose lands in East Lothian adjoined that fine ecclesiastical domain.[1] Lethington never forgave either the Queen or Bothwell, and least of all Darnley. Bothwell, having given no ordinary proofs of his fidelity on the late trying occasion, was restored to his hereditary office of Lord-Admiral, confirmed in the appointment of their Majesties' Lieutenant-General, and made Captain of Dunbar. Thus all the military force of the Crown was confided to his charge by the joint authority of the King and Queen, who, if they jarred in private, acted in perfect unity in affairs of state at this critical juncture. Darnley was, however, for having every one severely punished, while Mary was willing not to inquire too closely into the conduct of those who could plead an *alibi* on the night of the outrage. Among this number was her crafty brother Moray, whom she had never ceased to love, and earnestly desired to win over to her party. Intent on this object, Mary, at her hasty flitting from her palace of Holyrood, had charged one of her faithful ladies to tell Sir James Melville to persuade the Earl of Moray to leave the rebels and return to his

[1] Diurnal of Occurrents. Chalmers

allegiance. As Moray saw that their cause was hopeless, he sent Melville to the Queen at Haddington, with letters protesting his own innocence, and his entire repudiation "of those who had committed the late odious crime, solemnly pledging himself to have nothing more to do with them."[1] The credit due to his professions let the pens of his English confederates, Randolph and Bedford, testify, in the following postscript of the joint letter addressed by them to Cecil on the 27th of March, ten days after Mary had signed his pardon: "My Lord of Moray, by a special servant sent unto us, desireth your Honour's favour to these noblemen (Morton, Ruthven, and their accomplices) as his dear friends, and such as, for his sake, hath given this adventure."[2]

Moray only waited the opportunity of doing as much for these dear friends of his as they had adventured for his sake, and of doing it after the self-same fashion too. The confederacy between him and them remained, as their English coadjutors have shown, unbroken. The great object for which it was organised—the destruction of Queen Mary—was for the present rendered abortive by the unexpected part played by her husband in delivering her out of their cruel hands, but it was not abandoned. "The tragedy, which," as Sir Nicholas Throckmorton subsequently observes, "began with the death of David Riccio,"[3] was soon to be followed by that of the intractable Darnley, as a prelude and pretext for the accomplishment of the malignant purposes so long meditated against Mary herself. The first step towards this had been accomplished; mistrust and jealousy had been sown between the royal pair. Mary's heart was sore from some fresh cause of displeasure her husband had given her when she was at Haddington; for, in a private conversation with Sir James Melville, she lamented "the King's folly, unthankfulness, and misbehaviour, and also the treacherous dealing of his father, from whom he ought to have had far different counsel."[4] While Darnley, on the other hand, inquired of Melville, with jealous anxiety, "if my Lord of

[1] Melville's Memoirs. [2] Wright's Elizabeth and her Times, i. 235.
[3] Throckmorton to Queen Elizabeth. Stevenson's Illustrations—Maitland Miscellany. [4] Melville's Memoirs.

Moray had written to him?" Melville discreetly answered, "that his Lordship esteemed him and the Queen as one, and that his letter was written in haste." Darnley's self-importance was offended. "He might have written to me also," he petulantly observed; and then asked what had become of Morton, Ruthven, and the rest of that company. Melville told him "they had all fled, he knew not whither." "As they have brewen so let them drink," was Darnley's bitter rejoinder.[1]

That night, at Haddington, the Queen subscribed the remissions for her treacherous brother Moray, and all the Lords who had returned with him from Newcastle, with the light condition annexed that they should respectively repair to their own houses, and dwell there quietly for a month.[2] The next day, Monday, March 18, she returned in triumph to her metropolis, accompanied by her husband, attended by all the nobles of her party and their followers, and escorted by a loyal muster of nine thousand men, in warlike array, four companies whereof were embodied as infantry; the rest were horsemen. All Edinburgh came out to meet and welcome their Queen, who was received with the most flattering demonstrations of joy. One good result the late treasonable enterprise of the conspirators had effected—it had roused her energies, both of mind and body, to salutary activity; for, in consequence of the weakness incidental to her situation, she had fallen into valetudinarian habits of self-indulgence, and instead of taking proper exercise, had accustomed herself to be carried in a chair by four of her guards; but now, having been compelled to exert herself, she found herself able to ride on horseback, and to walk a considerable distance,[3] and was, of course, all the better for it.

Instead of proceeding to their palace of Holyrood, their Majesties took up their abode in Lord Home's house, opposite the Salt Trone, in the High Street, called the old Bishop of Dunkeld's lodging. About this mansion they caused field-pieces to be planted, and a guard to be set, for fear of a surprise.[4] The loyal nobles who attended their

[1] Melville's Memoirs.
[2] Ibid. Diurnal of Occurrents.
[3] Tytler's App., vol. vii.
[4] Diurnal of Occurrents. Knox. Chalmers.

Majesties lodged round it, and the city gates were vigilantly kept, both day and night, by men-at-arms.[1]

Mary's first care was to exonerate her consort, as far as she could, from the reproach and ill consequences of his folly, by granting him letters containing the fullest form of pardon that could be devised for every sort of treason it was possible to commit, "that if, in case of her death," she said, "proceedings should be instituted against him, he might be able to plead her forgiveness, and produce them in proof thereof."[2] These were documents of great importance to Darnley; for had his royal wife and Sovereign either died in childbed or undelivered, he would undoubtedly have stood amenable to the statutes against high treason. If Mary had borne the slightest malice against him, she would not have taken these prudential measures for protecting him from the vengeance of her country. It is generally supposed that it was by her desire that he protested before the Council "that he was innocent of the late treason and slaughter committed in the Abbey of Holyrood, and the detention of the Queen, and that all he had to do with it was his being so far overseen as to give consent, unknown to her Majesty, for the return of the Earl of Moray and the other Lords from England." Proclamation to the same effect was made at the Market Cross on the 21st of March; and it was forbidden, under penalty of treason, for any one to say the King was either art or part in the conspiracy. Mary endeavoured, in the temperate and guarded recital she put forth of the attempt on her liberty and government, to conceal his guilt as far as it was possible to do so, but the fact of his complicity was too notorious; it was exaggerated by the conspirators in self-defence, and blazoned abroad by the emissaries of the English Sovereign, for the purpose of affixing a stigma on the hitherto spotless reputation of the Scottish Queen.

Nothing could be more wretched than the position in which Darnley found himself placed by his late folly. His alliance with the conspirators had deprived him of the confidence of the Queen, and excited the contempt of her

[1] Diurnal of Occurrents. Knox, Hist. Ref. Scot.
[2] Adam Blackwood's Life of Queen Mary.

friends; his retreat from the conspiracy, denial of his own acts, and betrayal of the secrets of Morton and his confederates, provoked their scorn, their hatred, and their vengeance. His natural irritability was of course aggravated by his degradation in popular opinion; and his puerile jealousy of his consort's superior rank and importance increased by the homage and tokens of affection he saw lavished on her, while he was neglected, or only tolerated for her sake.

Morton, Ruthven, and the rest of the assassins and their numerous accomplices, were summoned to answer for their offences, and not appearing, were put to the horn, outlawed, and their possessions entered upon by the Crown authorities.[1] Several of the townsmen of Edinburgh were arrested for their share in this business, among whom were those old offenders Patrick Cranstoun and Andrew Armstrong, who had previously been imprisoned for raising a riot during divine service in the Queen's Chapel-royal, and in whose behalf John Knox wrote the seditious letters to convoke a tumultuary assembly in the autumn of 1564.[2] James Guthrie and Alexander Clerk, two of the ringleaders of the insurrectionary movement at St Leonard's Crags, were also in this conspiracy. The only persons punished with death were, Henry Yair, a traitor priest attached to the Queen's Chapel-royal, who, having entered Ruthven's service, had been present in the Queen's cabinet taking an active part in the murder of Riccio; and Thomas Scott, Sheriff-depute of Perth, who, as a magistrate holding the Queen's commission, could not be excused for so flagrant a breach of her laws. He was denounced by Darnley, who insisted on his being put to death,[3] and, as in the case of Moray, the Duke of Châtelherault and the other rebels opposed with great vehemence the Queen's natural disposition to clemency. Harlaw and Mowbray, two burgesses of inferior degree, were condemned to death, but reprieved at the foot of the ladder by the Queen's

[1] Diurnal of Occurrents. Knox, Hist. Ref. Scot. Tytler.
[2] Diurnal of Occurrents.
[3] Randolph to Cecil, April 4, 1566—Robertson's Appendix.

orders. The message of grace to these unhappy men was sent in great haste by the Earl of Bothwell, "who presented her Majesty's ring to the provost for safety of their lives," says Knox.[1] The informality of the pardon elicits a sarcasm; but probably, if Mary had waited for the preparation of a legal document, it would have arrived too late. The Provost understood at once that the ring was the token of the royal relentings in behalf of the death-doomed men. It was the revival of an ancient custom practised by Scottish monarchs before the date of the earliest sign-manual on record, when everything in Church and State was represented by types and symbols, the short-hand writing of the unlettered. There is something picturesque in the incident, like the extension of the golden sceptre of the Persian monarch in holy writ. Harlaw and Mowbray were, of course, only too happy to accept the mercy accorded to them at the gallows-foot by their injured liege lady, without being at all critical as to the manner in which it was signified, or by whom the pledge was brought.

Bothwell was at that time, we are told, the Queen's principal adviser. If so, it must be confessed the administration of affairs did him credit at that ticklish crisis, when equal firmness and forbearance were requisite. It is an interesting fact that his old enemies, Cockburn of Ormiston and the Lairds of Calder and Hulton, who were deeply implicated in the conspiracy, as they had been in all the treasons against their young Sovereign, from Somerset's invasion to this last outrage, and were in great peril of suffering the punishment due to their offences, were, through his intercession, extricated from their trouble, obtained remissions for their offences, and saved their estates.[2] The credit Bothwell possessed at this time was the result of his loyal services when the Queen was in the hands of the conspirators, and since her escape. He appears also to have enjoyed the confidence of Darnley.

Mary had been willing to persuade herself, as well as her subjects and the Princes of France and Spain, that her hus-

[1] Hist. Ref. Scot. Diurnal of Occurrents.
[2] Knox, Hist. Ref. Scot. Chalmers.

band had been the dupe and victim of the artful traitors with whom he had been entangled. She had told him, in the first moments of their reconciliation, "that she could not believe he had ever meditated anything against her, though he might have swerved from the right path through the frailty of youth; and that she prayed God to forgive, as she did, all the mischief his imprudence had caused."[1] His seducers, however, took malicious pleasure in tearing the veil from her eyes, by putting her in full possession of the evidences of his guilt. "The Queen," writes Randolph exultingly to Cecil, "hath now seen all the covenants and bonds that passed between the King and the Lords, and now findeth that his declaration before her and the Council, of his innocence of the death of David, was false, and is grievous offended that by their means he should seek to come by the crown-matrimonial."[2]

These revelations excited, as it was intended they should, fresh feelings of anger and distrust in the Queen's mind. The dearer Darnley had been to her, the keener were the pangs caused by his treachery and ingratitude. She could neither conceal her indignation nor her contempt; while he passionately observed, "that since he was held in so little account, he repented him of having forsaken the Lords;"[3] and then, with the intention of forming a fresh confederacy with Moray and Argyll, he abruptly left Edinburgh, and rode off to Stirling, accompanied by a dozen horsemen. But Moray and the others, warned by Robert Melville, whom the Queen sent in haste to forbid them to hold any communication with her husband, refused to treat with him.[4] The universal contempt in which Darnley was held at that time prevented him from doing any further mischief either to himself or the Queen. Under these humiliating circumstances, he sought the consolations of his church, confessed his sins, received spiritual counsel, "and was shriven," says Knox, "after the Papist fashion."[5] He

[1] Italian Despatch, from the Medicis Archives, dated March 28, 1566. Quoted in Tytler's Appendix, vol. vii.
[2] Randolph to Cecil, April 4. [3] Melville's Memoirs. [4] Ibid.
[5] Hist. Ref. Scot. Chalmers' Life of Queen Mary.

returned to Edinburgh in a better frame of mind than he left it. These proceedings explain the otherwise mysterious sentences in Morton and Ruthven's narrative: "Since the former division the King hath revolted from the Queen, and now is come to her again. The constancy of such a King I leave to you to judge of."[1].

It was reported by some busy tale-bearer that the Queen had said "that she would make the family of Lennox as poor as ever it had been in Scotland."[2] If so, her anger only vented itself in words, for she did not even banish her treacherous father-in-law from her realm, as she had full power to do. She only forbade him her presence; while, at the same time, she instructed her ambassador at the Court of England, Melville, to renew, with greater urgency on her part, solicitations to Queen Elizabeth for the liberation of the Countess of Lennox, "whose presence," she observes, "might do some good."[3]

Never had Mary's infelicity been greater than at this period. There were moments when, vainly longing to flee away and be at rest, she meditated a retreat to France, the only place where she had ever known a comparative degree of peace. She thought not of abdicating, but of confiding the government of her realm to a provisional regency, composed of five of her principal Lords—namely, Moray, Mar, Atholl, Huntley, and Bothwell.[4] The impossibility of inducing harmony between such jarring elements perhaps deterred her from carrying her desire into execution. Besides, the interests of her unborn infant were too dear to her to be endangered by such an unpopular measure as her lying in out of her own realm; neither was she at liberty to do so, for on the 5th of April an especial Council sat to decide where that event should take place, when it was unanimously agreed that Edinburgh Castle would be the safest and most commodious of all her royal abodes for the birth of the expected heir of the Crown.[5] Mary complied with the advice of her Ministers, and removed

[1] Keith's Appendix. [2] Ibid. [3] Instructions to Robert Melville.
[4] Lethington to Randolph, April 27—Calig. Cotton. Lib.
[5] Privy-Council Register—Keith.

to her royal fortress on the rock, with her ladies and officers of state.

Almost the first person she met on entering the castle was the unfortunate Earl of Arran, who had been under restraint there for nearly four years—first, on account of his implication with Bothwell in the plot for carrying her off from Falkland, and since because of his insanity, but above all, as a hostage for his father's conduct. The general belief was that he had gone mad for love of the Queen. He had made several attempts both on his own life and that of his servant since his confinement, and had been in danger of death from yellow jaundice (written by Randolph "yallor ganders"); but he was now in better health, and more lucid in mind. Mary was deeply touched when she saw him. She greeted him kindly, and kissed him as if no cloud had passed between them, nor mental malady deprived him of the ceremonial mark of respect due from the Sovereign to a Prince of the blood-royal. He knew her, and appeared sensible of the consideration with which she treated him. The interview had probably agitated the Queen, for the Council thought it best for him to leave the castle while her Majesty was there; and he was accordingly permitted to reside at the Hamilton palace, his paternal abode, as a prisoner at large, several noblemen and gentlemen becoming bond for his good behaviour.[1]

A very remarkable letter from Mary to Queen Elizabeth is dated from Edinburgh Castle, April 4, in reply to a complimentary epistle, of which Elizabeth had made Robert Melville the bearer on his return to Scotland. After a courteous acknowledgment of the civilities of her sister sovereign, Mary adverts to the recent outrage in these words, "When Melville arrived, he found me newly escaped from the hands of the greatest traitors on the face of the earth."[2] She refers Elizabeth to the bearer for full particulars; and having repeated their barbarous threat of cutting her in pieces, and throwing her over the walls, which had left a vivid impression on her mind, she continues, in these words:—

[1] Chalmers.

[2] Labanoff, vol. vii.

. "Judge, I entreat you, what cruel intentions those were of subjects against a Sovereign who can boast that she has never done them wrong! But our good and loyal lieges having now rallied round us, with purpose to devote their lives to our service and the establishment of justice, we are returned to this city with the intention of chastising some who have been guilty of this atrocious deed, and we are now in this castle, as the bearer can certify, to whom we refer you for further information. I must, however, entreat you to give orders to your authorities on the Border to fulfil your good inclinations towards me, and the maintenance of peace, by expelling those who have sought my life from the places within their jurisdiction, where the ringleaders of this fine action have been as well received as if your intention towards me had been the worst in the world; for, contrary to what I believe of you, I have likewise heard that the Earl of Morton has gone to you. If so, I must beg you to arrest him, and send him back to me. I assure you he will not scruple to say everything contrary to the facts, to excuse himself; but you will neither find him reasonable nor veritable. I pray you, my good sister, to oblige me in these requests, and assure yourself that, as I have suffered so much ingratitude from mine own, I will never fall into the like sin.

"In order to confirm our friendship, I request you that, whatsoever God may send me, you will be pleased to cement our relationship and alliance by being my gossip" (godmother to the child); "and I hope, if I rise up again recovered in the month of July, and you make your progress so near as they say you intend to these parts, I shall, if agreeable to you, go to meet and thank you myself, which, on my faith, I have the greatest wish to do of anything in the world. I will not importune you farther at this time. Excuse my bad writing, for I am so large I cannot stoop, and whenever I exert myself in any way it makes me ill."[1]

In her postscript, Mary expresses a hope that the next person whom Elizabeth accredits as a resident ambassador may prove more conducive to their friendship than Randolph had been.

The abode of Morton and the other assassins at Newcastle caused much uneasiness and alarm to Mary, who was haunted with terrors of some fresh attack from that quarter.[2] In compliance with her earnest requisition to Queen Elizabeth, that she would not harbour her traitors there, Elizabeth sent orders for them to depart from Newcastle; but the message to that effect was accompanied with a hint "that England was a wide field, and they would find as good accommodation elsewhere, and nearer Scotland." Morton and his accomplices accordingly proceeded to Alnwick, where they lurked in readiness to return at a few hours' notice, to co-operate in any plot with their confeder-

[1] Labanoff, vol. vii. [2] Tytler. Chalmers.

ates on the north of the Tweed.[1] A temporary reconciliation having taken place between Mary and Darnley, they held a Court in Edinburgh Castle, to receive Moray, Argyll, and the other banished Lords, whose month of probation being fully expired, they were admitted to their Majesties' presence on the 21st of April, and renewed their oaths of allegiance.[2] Mary, anxiously desiring, in case of her death, to leave her realm in quietness, held a sort of peace congress in the Castle, exerting herself to the utmost of her power to reconcile the deadly feuds between Moray, Huntley, Bothwell, Atholl, and others, and so far succeeded that they all consented to meet amicably at a banquet she gave to celebrate their reconciliation. She relaxed Makgill, and several others equally guilty, from the process of the horn, at the suit of Moray, and would have extended her grace to Lethington and others, but for the determined opposition of Darnley.

It has generally been stated that Mary went to Stirling, intending to lie in there, and from Stirling to Alloa, in order to avoid her husband—a mistake which has originated from Sir James Melville having misplaced his account of her visits to these places, as well as misrepresented her behaviour to Darnley. The minutes of the Privy-Council and Privy-Seal Registers prove that she never left Edinburgh from the time she returned thither from Dunbar, March 18th, till the following July, after the birth of her son.

Mary and Darnley were together in Edinburgh Castle on the 27th of April, and in friendly conference on the subject of preparations for the sylvan sports in which both greatly delighted; for on that day they unite in addressing a precept to their comptroller, which bears their united signatures, "Marie R., Henry R.," regarding "the home-bringing of hawks to them from Orkney," stating "that it had been the ancient custom for the royal falconers to resort thither yearly for that purpose, and desiring him both to make the necessary disbursements for that purpose, and arrangements for the safe and thankful reception of the said hawks, which," continue their Majesties, "are as neces-

[1] Tytler. Chalmers. [2] Diurnal of Occurrents.

sair for us as ony other the like thing, as weil for our own pastime as for the gratification of our freindis."[1]

Mauvissière de Castelnau was sent by the King and Queen-mother of France to congratulate Mary on her escape from her late peril, and to offer her such comfort as the painful circumstances in which she was placed by her husband's misconduct seemed to require. Joseph Riccio, the brother of her late Secretary, arrived in the train of the French ambassador, most probably to look after David's effects; and Mary, who knew not at that time whom to trust with her ciphers and private foreign correspondence, prevailed on him to accept the office previously held by his unfortunate brother—a fact that has often been mentioned to her reproach. That it was an unpopular measure there can be no doubt; but surrounded as she was by traitors and spies, who can wonder if she gave her confidence to strangers, when she had experienced so little gratitude and consideration from her own countrymen and subjects?

Mary has been accused by Buchanan of causing the mangled remains of David Riccio to be deposited in the royal vault in the Chapel of Holyrood, close to the coffin of her father and his first Queen, Magdalene of France. The incorrectness of this statement was fully proved, when, on the desecration of the Chapel in the succeeding century, the vault was violated, and all the coffins, with their inscriptions, exposed to the light of day, at which time it was apparent that David was not buried there, and that, in order to make room for Darnley's remains, those of the infant princes, Mary's brothers, had been placed across the feet of the others.[2] Mary, it is true, removed the body of her faithful servant from the churchyard of the Canongate, where it had been interred without any religious ceremony, in order to give it burial, according to the rites of his religion, in the cemetery of Holyrood Chapel,[3] that being the only place where the dirge, and other offices which Roman Catholics deemed essential for the repose of

[1] Original document in the Royal Record Office, Register House, Edinburgh.

[2] Majorybanks' Annals of Scotland, p. 18. Goodall. Chalmers. Arnot's History of Edinburgh.

[3] Ibid.

the dead, were tolerated. This simple fact has been thus wilfully perverted into an injurious fiction by a writer who was well aware that Mary's conduct was dictated by piety, which, however mistakenly, would have been regarded as a work of charity imperative on her, under the peculiar circumstances, by the Church of Rome, in which he had himself formerly exercised the functions of a priest.

The letter written by Mary some time in May to her uncle's widow, Anne Duchess of Guise, presents a melancholy picture of the depression of spirits under which she was labouring at this period. None of the joyful anticipations of maternity are expressed by the young Sovereign. She speaks only of the troubles and vexations with which she finds herself surrounded, and the weariness of body and general weakness incidental to her situation. Yet she enters with affectionate interest into the happy prospects of her illustrious correspondent on her approaching second marriage, and adds her wishes for her happiness with her future consort, their mutual kinsman, the Duke de Nemours.[1]

It was at this period that Moray recovered his old ascendancy over the mind of his royal sister, and had made himself so completely the master of the Castle, of which his uncle, the Earl of Mar, was then the governor, that neither the Earls of Bothwell, Huntley, nor Atholl were permitted to sleep within its walls. As for Darnley, offended and jealous at Moray's superior influence and importance, he withdrew himself from the Castle to Holyrood Abbey, where he took up his abode with his father in sullen discontent.[2]

[1] Labanoff, vol. i. [2] Randolph's Correspondence. Adam Blackwood.

MARY STUART

CHAPTER XXIII.

SUMMARY

Queen Mary in Edinburgh Castle—Intentions of the English Council in her favour—Queen Elizabeth asks Mary for recipe to preserve her from smallpox marks—Mary's letter in reply—Mary takes her chamber to await the birth of her child—Convenes her nobles—Birth of a Prince—Pretended sorcery of Lady Atholl on that occasion—Queen visited by Darnley in her lying-in chamber—She shows him their new-born son (*see Vignette*)—His paternal recognition of the babe—Pathetic scene of reproach and reconciliation—National joy for the birth of a Prince—Queen Mary's reception of the Superintendant of Lothian with congratulations and address from the Presbytery—She puts her baby into his arms, and listens to his prayer — Mary ill from imprudent exertions—Her reception of English ambassador—Her Scotch nurses and nursery establishment for her son — Queen Elizabeth's mortification at the news of Mary's safety, and birth of her son—Fresh discord between Mary and Darnley—His jealousy of Moray—Repeats his determination to have him slain—Mary's alarm and anger—Her care for her brother's life—Darnley's perverse behaviour—Mary's state voyage to Alloa to visit the Earl of Mar—Falsehoods of Buchanan—Mary and Darnley together at Alloa Castle—Her employments there—Intercedes for a poor widow and her bairns — Pardons Lethington —Darnley's opposition to her clemency—They return to Edinburgh —Fresh discord ensues when Moray returns — Darnley's irascibility — Moray charges him with designs against his life — Queen will love no one who is unfriendly to her brother—Disputes in her presence between Moray and Bothwell — Moray menaces Bothwell, and drives him away from Court—Moray's despotic power over the Queen—Queen goes with Darnley on a hunting progress—Her liberal conduct in religion offends Darnley—He writes to complain to the Pope of Mary's want of zeal for the Church of Rome—His headlong bigotry.

WHILE Mary, sad but patient, was endeavouring to beguile her cares by reading and plying her needle among her ladies in Edinburgh Castle, and superintending the prepara-

tions for her confinement, an incident occurred which ought to have relieved her mind from all anxiety regarding the English succession. Queen Elizabeth was suddenly attacked with an illness of so alarming a character that, her death being confidently expected, both parties in the Privy Council, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, without confiding their intentions to each other, made up their minds, in case of that event taking place, to proclaim the Queen of Scots as the Sovereign of England and Ireland. Mary's charms of mind and person, her learning and accomplishments, the feminine sweetness of her manners, her liberal sentiments, her clemency and generous temper, would probably have been better appreciated among the more civilised gentlemen of England than in her own then semi-barbarous realm, where, indeed, the poisonous influence of English gold had created a base counterbalance against her gentle influence. Elizabeth's malady, which at first had puzzled her medical attendants, proved to be smallpox; and as soon as the pustules appeared, all danger was over. The redness, roughness, and certain traces of the irruption, however, remaining, the royal spinster, in great alarm lest her complexion should be spoiled, and remembering that Mary's beauty had escaped uninjured from the effects of the like malady, wrote to her a very affectionate letter announcing her convalescence, inquiring the name of the physician who had treated her so successfully, and begging her to send the prescription which had preserved her complexion unmarred. The bearer of this letter was no other than Randolph, that treacherous diplomatist, who had caused the young Scottish Queen so much trouble by intriguing against her with her disloyal nobles, and had done his utmost to injure her fair fame by his malignant slanders. Of the latter offence Mary was, of course, unconscious; but as she had, in consequence of his malpractices, expelled him from her Court with disgrace, and forbidden him ever to set foot again within her realm, and had also alluded to his misconduct in her letter to Elizabeth of the 4th of April, it was a decided breach of etiquette on the part of that Princess sending him into Scotland again on any pretence whatsoever.

Nothing can afford a more convincing proof of the placability of Mary's temper than the fact that she admitted him to her presence, and treated him with her wonted courtesy as the accredited bearer of his Sovereign's letters, without any allusions to his previous offences. She, however, prudently dismissed him, as soon as he had acquitted himself of his errand, with a verbal message to his royal mistress, preferring to make the French ambassador, Mauvissière, who was returning through London, the bearer of the following friendly response to Elizabeth's letter, congratulating her on her recovering from her late dangerous illness, and communicating all the information in her power as to the means adopted for the preservation of her face from the ravages of the smallpox.

MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS TO QUEEN ELIZABETH.

"May, 1566.

"I cannot, my good sister, do aught but praise my fortune which suffers me not to receive more trouble than I have strength and fortitude to bear. So thoroughly is good mixed with evil, that I find more cause, through the receipt of letters written by your own hand, to thank God for your recovery, than to bemoan your malady (which I did with all my heart, more especially since I heard of the great danger you were in), and now you are so well quitted of it that your beautiful face has diminished nought of its perfections.

"Randolph has prayed me to send you the receipt which preserved me in a similar case; but I cannot do as I wish in respect to this, for he who prescribed for me is dead. It was Fernel, first physician to the King, Henry II. of France. He would never tell me the receipt for the water he put to my face, after having punctured it all over with a lancet; besides, it would now be too late for you to use it.

"How I was treated afterwards, you will see in the memorandums enclosed. Much concerned am I that I did not know it sooner, as I might have sent to you the person whom I deem the most efficient in this complaint, who is still with me."[1]

The period when Mary had the smallpox was when she first started into early womanly beauty, before her marriage with the Dauphin, Francis de Valois. The circumstance of her escaping uninjured in complexion or features was commemorated in a flowery Latin poem by Adriani Turnebi, who attributes the attack of the smallpox to the jeal-

[1] From the original French, printed in Labanoff's Recueil des Lettres de Marie Stuart, Appendix, vol. vii. State Paper Office MS., autograph.

ousy of Venus dreading to see her charms surpassed by those of the blooming Scottish Queen; but the envious purposes of the goddess of beauty were, according to his mythological conceit, defeated by the protection of Juno, and the interposition of Pallas, for the preservation of the fair face of Mary Stuart, so that she not only escaped uninjured, but came forth in improved loveliness—a result of rare occurrence after the smallpox. No wonder her good cousin of England was so anxious to obtain the prescription which had wrought such wonders.

"I assure you," continues Mary, "I know nothing that could be of service to you but what I would employ, as a good sister ought to do, feeling that my love is recompensed with corresponding affection; of which I make no doubt, relying on your promises, and the constancy of the heart you have given me in exchange for mine. Having arrived at this conclusion, and not to weary you with too long a discourse, I will make an end, after informing you of the pacification of the troubles which lately afflicted me—more, however, for the sake of those whom God has so far forsaken, than from any danger to be apprehended from them, having full confidence in my subjects, who have proved themselves such as all sovereigns might wish to have; and it is to be hoped they will be all the better for the example, that God's wrath has so evidently fallen on the wicked.[1]

"I have no doubt but Randolph will have so fully advertised you of everything, that I shall not need to trouble you with a longer letter for the present, save to kiss your fair hands, and praying God that He will give you, Madam, my good sister, health, and a very long and happy life, with every good you can desire.

"Your faithful and affectionate good sister and cousin for ever,

"MARIE R."[2]

According to the ancient customs of female royalty on such occasions, Mary took her chamber with the usual ceremonies the first Monday in June,[3] there to await the birth of the expected heir of the crown. She had built for her own use within the castle a suite of apartments, which are still distinguished by the regal initials of herself and her consort, M. H. R., entwined together in her well-known

[1] Mary probably alludes here to the death of Ruthven, who departed this life at Newcastle on the 13th of May, having kept his bed ever since his arrival in England.

[2] Endorsed "To Madame my good sister, the Queen of England." On the margin is written "May 1566. The Queen of Scots to the Queen's Majesty, by Malvosir" (Mauvissière de Castelnau).—Royal Letters—State Paper Office MS.

[3] Randolph to Cecil, June 7, 1566—State Paper Office MS., inedited.

conjugal monogram over the portal.[1] She sometimes took the air within the precincts of the castle during the intermediate days, and once walked nearly a mile beyond the walls. She was, however, painfully haunted at this period with apprehensions of Morton and the other assassins of Riccio returning to consummate their deadly purposes against her and her babe.

Several suspected characters who had been ordered to quit the realm "tarried to sée what would become of the Queen in the time of her travail."[2] Anticipating herself the worst, she made her will, which she copied thrice, sending one duplicate to France, keeping another herself, and reserving a third for her executors. It was supposed she had appointed three regents. Who these were has never transpired. She had reconciled herself to her husband, but did not restore him to her confidence, for he declared himself ignorant of the contents of her testament.[3]

Queen Mary was at this time wholly in the hands of Moray and his uncle the Earl of Mar, the captain of the castle, which the latter had refused to deliver up to her, declaring that he held it of the Estates of Scotland, not of the Sovereign. No one but Darnley, who was indisposed during part of the time, was allowed to sleep within the walls of the fortress. It is supposed that every arrangement had been made by Moray, with the assistance of the English faction, to seize the crown in the expected event of the Queen's death in childbirth, or the regency, if she left a living infant. Mary summoned her nobles to her metropolis on Sunday, June 9th; her Lord-Chancellor, the Earl of Huntley, and his brother-in-law Bothwell, were already there, but were not permitted to sleep in the castle.[4] A friendly message of comfort and encouragement was sent about this time to Mary by Queen Elizabeth, signifying that "she wished her short pain and a happy hour."

The anxiously expected event took place on Wednesday the 19th of June 1566, between nine and ten o'clock in the

[1] Robert Chambers's Life of James VI.
[2] Randolph to Cecil, June 7. [3] Ibid. [4] Ibid.

morning, when the Queen gave birth to a fair and goodly boy after sore travail, and with great peril of her life.[1] Mary was attended on this occasion by Margaret Houseton, the widow of a person of the name of Beveridge. Mistress Margaret, besides the usual fees and perquisites, was rewarded with an annual grant, "for her own and her son Thomas Beveridge's life, of two chalders and four bolls of *bear* from the new town of Falkland, for her good service to the Queen at the birth of the Prince of this realm."[2] Notwithstanding this tribute of the royal gratitude for the skill of the Scotch midwife, it was subsequently asserted by blinded malice and superstition, "that the Queen got safe and easy delivery by the aid of sorcery, her friend Lady Atholl having by her witchcraft cast all the pains her Majesty ought to have suffered on Lady Reres, who was lying in childbirth in Edinburgh Castle at the same time, and was never so troubled of any bairne she ever bore."[3]

A quaint poetic prayer for the newborn heir of the realm was composed, and, probably by the order of the royal mother, emblazoned on one of the pannels of the chamber where he first saw the light. This is generally said to be the small cabinet in Edinburgh Castle, where the following lines are still shown in the characters of the period:—

---

[1] See her letter to Lady Lennox, in vol. ii., Lives of the Queens of Scotland and English Princesses. This is confirmed by what Melville told Queen Elizabeth.

[2] Register of Signatures, quoted in Chalmers' Notes.

[3] Richard Bannatyne's Memorials. Dalzel's Darker Superstitions. Buchanan pretends that "Lady Reres was an old woman, who had in her youth been Bothwell's mistress;" but she must have been in the prime of life, being a fruitful mother with a young infant. She was the wife of Sir Arthur Forbes, Laird of Reres, in Fifeshire, who afterwards took deadly vengeance on the Earl of Moray's Secretary, John Wood, for the calumnies he had assisted in circulating of his lady and the Queen. Lady Reres was probably wet-nurse to the infant Prince, and till the appointment of Lady Mar to the office of Lady Mistress or State Governess, she had the control of the royal nursery department. Witness the following entries in the Treasury Records, communicated by my late learned friend, Alexander Macdonald, Esq.:—

"Item, the 14th day of September, by the Queen's grace precept to the Lady Reres, for the Prince's chalmer, twa coffers, X £. Item, 60 ells of small linen to be sheets to the Ladie Reres and Maistres nurse, the ell V S small, XV £. The next item is for 100 ells of linen for sheets, for the Prince's rockers."

"Lord Jesu Chryst that Crownit was with Thornis
Preserve the Birth quhais Bodgie heir is borne.
And send her Sonee Successione to Reigne still
Lang in this Realme. if that it be Thy will
Als Grant O Lord quhat ever of Hir proceed
Be to thy Glorie Honer and Prais sobied."[1]

This cabinet was perhaps, at that time, part of the Queen's chamber, or formed the screened recess where her bed stood, for it is scarcely large enough to have admitted her personal attendants, much less the numerous witnesses who must have been present to verify the birth of the heir of the Crown, under the peculiar circumstances of the case, to prevent the possibility of the fact that Mary had borne a living child being disputed. Nor is it likely that her physicians would have allowed her to be stifled in so small an apartment in the month of June, when there were spacious rooms in the same suite.[2]

The happy tidings of the safety of the Queen, and the birth of the Prince Stuart of Scotland, were announced by a triumphant discharge of the castle guns, although these

[1] Lord Jesus Christ, that crowned was with thorn,
Preserve the birth whose body here is born;
And send her son succession to reign still
Long in this realm, if that it be thy will;
Also grant, O Lord, whate'er of her proceed,
Be to thy glory, honour, and praise, indeed.

[2] It is, however, regarded as a heresy in any sceptical visitor of Edinburgh Castle to question the probability of the tradition, or to suggest the possibility that the pannel bearing apparently such positive testimony as to the place of the royal infant's nativity, might, in some of the desecrating changes that have befallen the Maiden Castle, have been removed from its original station, in like manner as the tombstone of a child with this quaint epitaph,

"My parents dear
Did lay me here,"

has found its way from the village churchyard where the boy, whose name and age it commemorates, was buried, into the museum at Worcester.

It is scarcely necessary to add that the absurd tale of the little Prince being lowered from the window down the steep rock, a few days after his birth, is untrue. It has originated evidently in local traditions connected with the escape of the children of St Margaret during the siege of Edinburgh Castle, or the device employed by Jane Beaufort, the widow of James I., to get possession of the person of the young King, her son, whom she privily sent out of Edinburgh Castle packed up in a basket or maund of linen.

were in startling proximity to the head of the royal mother.[1] At two o'clock the same afternoon the King, attended by Sir William Standen, came to visit the Queen, being desirous to see the child. "My Lord," said Mary, "God has given you and me a son whose paternity is of none but you."[2] Then, fondly taking the lovely infant in her arms and uncovering his face, she presented him to her husband with these words, "My Lord, here I protest to God, and as I shall answer to Him at the great day of judgment, this is your son, and no other man's son; and I am desirous that all here, both ladies and other, bear witness, for he is so much your own son that I fear it may be the worse for him hereafter." The King blushed deeply—he felt the pathetic dignity of the implied reproach, and, perhaps to conceal his confusion, bowed his face over the bed and kissed the babe in the royal mother's arms. Then the Queen said to Sir William Standen, "This is the Prince whom I hope shall first unite the two kingdoms of England and Scotland." "Why, Madam," answered Sir William, a little surprised; "shall he succeed before your Majesty and his father!" "Alas!" sighed Mary, "his father has broken to me." Hearing these words, the King said, "Sweet Madam, is this your promise that you made to forgive and forget all?" "I have forgiven all," observed Mary, "but can never forget."[3] The fond fierce instincts of maternity which the sight of her newborn infant had awakened, had also recalled an indignant remembrance of the danger to which that precious one had been exposed, through the unkindness and folly of his inconsiderate father, and she could not refrain from the reproachful question, "What if Faudonside's[4] pistol had shot?—what would have

[1] Life of James VI., by Robert Chambers.

[2] Historic of Marie Queen of Scots, by Lord Herries.

[3] See the vignette to the present volume, designed by our accomplished artist, Gourlay Steel, Esq., in illustration of this most interesting incident in Mary Stuart's wedded life—her presentation of her newborn son, afterwards James VI. of Scotland, and first Sovereign of Great Britain, to her husband.

[4] Sir Andrew Ker of Faudonside, Ruthven's nephew, who brutally presented a loaded dag, or horse-pistol, to the side of the pregnant Queen on the night of David Riccio's assassination. Mary would never sign a remission for this ruffian. After her fall he returned, and subsequently married the widow of John Knox, a daughter of Lord Ochiltree.

become of him and me both? or what estate would you have been in? God only knows, but we may suspect." "Madam," answered Darnley, "these things are all past." "Then," said Mary, "let them go." [1]

It would be well for all injured wives if they could come to the same wise resolution in regard to bygone grievances. Unfortunately for poor Mary, she had those about her whose selfish purposes could only be served by planting and nourishing fresh seeds of strife between her and her irascible consort, who loved her more than he was himself aware or she suspected. The above agitating scene took place before a numerous company, assembled for the purpose of witnessing the important ceremonial of the Queen's presentation of the newborn heir of the Crown to her husband, for his paternal recognition, being neither more nor less than a public affiliation of the babe—a ceremonial prescribed by the ancient customs of regality in Scotland, in case the royal father had not been present at the birth of the eldest child, to receive it in his arms, bless and acknowledge it before his nobles as his undoubted offspring, and the heir of the Crown. The aspersions Darnley's insane folly had been the means of casting on his royal consort's conjugal fidelity, rendered the earliest possible compliance with this old observance doubly requisite; and Mary, in the conscious dignity of her integrity, shrank not from the performance of her maternal duty, though, in her weak state, so exciting a discussion might have cost her her life. But her own honour was at stake, as well as the verification of the legitimacy of her first-born son—considerations which impelled her to act with the spirit which the painful circumstances of the case demanded. Hence the pathetic solemnity of her address to her offending but repentant husband in the presence of her Court, and her appeal to the almighty Judge, at whose tribunal both must stand at the great day, when the secrets of all hearts should be revealed, for the truth of her declaration. If she had not taken that opportunity of adverting to the intolerable insults and per-

[1] Lord Herries's Historie of Mary Queen of Scots, Abbotsford edition, edited by Pitcairn.

sonal danger to which she and her infant had been exposed, through the folly of her inconsiderate husband, she had been more or less than woman; but, to use her own pithy observation on the fallibility of female judgment, it may be pleaded in her excuse, "that the wisest and best of women is but a woman at the best." She certainly succeeded in making Darnley heartily ashamed of himself, and eliciting from him an acknowledgment of his need of her forgiveness.

No traces of the differences which had arisen between the royal pair are perceptible in the letter written by Darnley, the same day, to Mary's uncle, Cardinal de Guise, to announce the birth of their infant son. His letter, though brief, is affectionately worded, and expresses feelings of conjugal and paternal joy at an event calculated at once to increase his own importance, and to cement the close though rudely-shaken tie which united him and the august mother of the newborn heir of Great Britain.

To Monsieur the Cardinal de Guise.

"From the Castle of Edinburgh, this 19th day of June 1566.—In great haste.

"Sir my Uncle,—Having so favourable an opportunity of writing to you by this gentleman, who is on the point of setting off, I would not omit to inform you that the Queen my wife has just been delivered of a son—an event which, I am sure, will not cause you less joy than ourselves; also to let you know that I have written on my part, as the Queen my wife has on hers, to the King [of France], begging him to be pleased to oblige and honour us by standing godfather for him, whereby he will increase the debt of gratitude I owe him for all his favours to me, for the which I shall always be ready to make every return in my power. So, having nothing more agreeable to inform you of at present, I conclude, praying God, Monsieur my uncle, to have you always in His holy and worthy keeping.

"Your very humble and obedient nephew,

"Henry R.

"Please to present my commendations to Madame the Dowager de Guise."[1]

Darnley was evidently proud of his boy, and Mary "happy in a mother's first sweet cares;" and thus a brief interlude

[1] A confidential letter was written by the Earl of Moray to Cecil on the 19th of June, in which he apprises the English Premier of the safe delivery of the Queen, and the birth of a Prince; begging, at the same time, to remind him of "the important and weighty matters that were between himself and the Queen's Majesty his mistress." These boded no good to his royal sister.

of harmony was restored by the birth of their child. That auspicious event was hailed with unbounded transports of joy in Edinburgh;[1] bonfires blazed the same night on Arthur Seat, the Calton Hill, and were repeated on all the beacon stations through the length and breadth of the land, diffusing gladness through the hearts of Mary's loving people, that the regal succession was to be continued in her issue, and the name of Stuart perpetuated. The whole of the nobles and civil dignitaries, and a vast concourse of people of all degrees, assembled in the Church of St Giles on the morrow, and united in a solemn act of thanksgiving to God for the safety of the Queen, and the national blessing which had been granted in the birth of an heir to the Crown. The Kirk Assembly having just met, Spottiswood, the Superintendant of Lothian, was deputed by the brethren to wait on her Majesty, and testify their gladness for the birth of the Prince, and to desire that he should be baptised after the manner practised in the Reformed Church. Mary received the Superintendant in her lying-in chamber, and accepted his congratulations very graciously. Then desiring the Prince to be brought, she gave him herself into the arms of the venerable divine, who, immediately falling on his knees, delivered a short but very eloquent prayer in behalf of the newborn heir of Scotland, to which the royal mother listened with devout attention. In conclusion, the Superintendant playfully addressed the babe, and desired him to "say Amen for himself," some little cooing murmur having escaped its unconscious lips, as if in response to the prayer of the Presbyterian minister. Queen Mary was much pleased, "and ever after called the Superintendant her Amen.[2] The young Prince did the same when he was

[1] Chambers's Life of James VI. Knox, Hist. Ref. Scot.

[2] Spottiswood's Hist. Church Scot. Painful it is to add, that Spottiswood became a bitter persecutor of his amiable and liberal-minded Queen; for he was the author of that most disgracefully uncharitable letter in which, after her escape from Lochleven, he endeavours to inflame the minds of her subjects against her, in language as unjustifiable as it was cruel.—See Keith on Ecclesiastical Affairs, 591. James VI. made the son of this anti-Episcopalian minister Archbishop of Glasgow, and afterwards of St Andrews—thus elevating him to the primacy of Scotland. He requested him withal to write the History of the Church of Scotland. "It is not unknown to your Majesty," replied

old enough to understand the story, and whilst he lived did respect and reverence him as his spiritual father."

Among the few acts of superstition that can be recorded of Mary, may he noticed that, at the birth of her son, she made a vow to send his weight in virgin wax to the Nôtre Dame of Clery, to make there a "neuvfaine." She promised also to provide that a mass should be sung in the church of Clery[1] every day, for a year, accompanied by a daily donation of "*treize-trezains*" to thirteen poor persons who attended divine service in the morning. The harassing and exciting events which followed the birth of her child caused Mary to forget this vow, until it recurred to her memory in long years after, during the solitary hours of her imprisonment at Sheffield Castle, when she wrote to her ambassador to have it fulfilled.[2]

When the English envoy Killigrew arrived in Edinburgh on the 23d of June, four days after the birth of the Prince, he heard the Queen had been very ill in consequence of having exerted herself imprudently too soon. Killigrew informs

the Archbishop, "that your Majesty's mother, being defamed by the bold writings of a malicious party, and the credulity of easy people, who, to avoid the trouble of searching into them, swallow such reports as those without chewing, hath not left a clear name behind her; and as, in mine own particular judgment, I cannot join with them in those scandals which they have, with so malicious a falsehood, cast upon her, so your Majesty must give me leave to say, that in all things she did I cannot approve of her; and being of necessity to speak of her in the series of this History, what to do therein I know not."—"Speak the truth, man, and spare not," was the noble rejoinder of the King to the historian. Much, however, it is to be regretted that Archbishop Spottiswood followed the evil example of those whose indolence and credulity he had censured; and instead of taking the time and trouble of examining into records and collating evidences, has repeated, though not in a malicious spirit, the scandals and falsehoods of the very party whose malicious motives he so clearly perceived. His history of Mary's period is neither more nor less than a digest of Knox and Buchanan, clothed in more decent language, and has therefore done her more injury than the coarse vituperation of the one and the unscrupulous inventions of the other. De Thou, also, having neither personal information of his own, nor opportunities of access to documentary evidences, repeated the gross calumnies of Buchanan, whose high reputation as a scholar gave undue weight to his political libels against his benefactress.

[1] Clery is situated on the Loire between Blois and Orleans, both residences with which Mary was familiar in her youth. It is the same Nôtre Dame to which Louis XI. paid his ill-directed veneration.

[2] Labanoff, vol. v. p. 135. Letter of the Queen of Scots to the Archbishop of Glasgow, dated from Sheffield, March 18, 1580.

Cecil "that the birth of the Prince had caused general joy, and that he understood he was a very goodly child."[1] Mary signified her satisfaction at the arrival of the envoy from her good sister of England, and sent one of the Melvilles to bid him welcome in her name, and to tell him "he should have audience as soon as she might have any ease from the pain she was in. In the mean time," continues Killigrew, "her Grace commanded a bed of her own, of crimson velvet, to be set up in my chamber; and, as I guess, willed my Lord of Moray to call me to dine with him this day, being Sunday, for that I determined to keep my chamber till I might have audience of her Majesty. He sent me word to come to the sermon, where I found the Earls of Huntley, Argyll, Moray, Mar, and Crawford, and dined with the Earls of Argyll and Moray, which keep house together."[2] The position of the rival parties then struggling for the mastery in the realm of Scotland is thus described in the same letter: "The Earls of Argyll, of Moray, Mar, and Atholl, presently in Court, be now linked together; and Huntley and Bothwell with their friends on the other side. The Earl of Bothwell and Mr Maxwell be both upon the borders of Scotland, bearing the Queen in mind that there is some practice to bring in the Earl of Morton during her childbed; but the truth is, the Earl of Bothwell would not gladly be in danger of the four above named, which all lie in the Castle; and it is thought and said that Bothwell's credit with the Queen is more than all the rest together, so as I see little trust and good meaning betwixt them. The Queen's husband lyeth also in the Castle, but my Lord his father in the town: methinks, for all the young Prince, there is little account made of them. My Lord of Lennox sent me even now a man of his, with offers of courtesy for my Sovereign's sake"—intended, of course, for an intimation that he was ready to join in any intrigues for the deposition of his royal daughter-in-law, for Mary could not be persuaded to receive Lennox, or to show him the slightest countenance, because of the evil part he had played in alienating her husband's confidence from her, and exciting him

[1] Killigrew to Cecil, June 24, 1566—State Paper MS. ined. [2] Ibid.

to mischievous intrigues against her. As Lennox had undoubtedly done this while he was outwardly on affectionate terms with Mary, we may judge what his conduct was when treated by her with the contempt his perfidy and ingratitude merited. If Mary had been an angel in woman's form, or endowed with the wifely patience of Griselda herself, small would have been her chance of conjugal happiness so long as the selfish and unprincipled Earl of Lennox continued to exercise his pernicious influence over the weak mind and excitable passions of her husband. It was, of course, natural for Darnley to think well of his father, and to regard him as his best adviser; but he ought to have remembered that, when he entered the conjugal state with Mary, he had promised to "forsake father and mother, and cleave to her."

Killigrew wrote the same day, but at a later hour, communicating the following interesting particulars of his visits to the lying-in chamber of Queen Mary and the nursery of the infant heir of Scotland.[1] "My Lord of Moray sent me word this morning how the Queen Ma^te^ would speak with me this afternoon, only to see her, and to deliver my letters and commendations which I had from the Queen my Sovereign. Accordingly, at 3 of the clock, his Lordship sent a gentleman for me, and took me with him from his lodging to the Queen's castle, where the Earl of Mar, captain of the castle, met us, and by them both, without any pause, I was brought to the Queen's bedside, where her Highness received thankfully my Sovereign's letters and commendations, desiring me 'to excuse her for proceeding any farther at that time,' saying, 'that as soon as she could get any strength I should have access unto her again.' So as when I had used words the fittest I could for that purpose, I took my leave and was brought to the young Prince, whom I founde sucking of his *nouryce* [nurse], and afterwards did see him as good as naked—I mean his head, feet, and hands—and all, to my judgment, well proportioned, and like to prove a goodly Prince. Her Ma^te^ was so bold, immediately after her delivery, as yet she hath

[1] Killigrew to Cecil, Edinburgh, June 24, 1566—State Paper Office MS., inedited. Affairs of Scotland.

not recovered; few words she spake, and those faintly, with a hollow cough. She heartily thanked the Queen Ma^te^ her good sister, said 'that I was welcome, and that she would give me further audience as speedily as her state would permit.'"[1]

Mary, with great propriety of feeling, gave the newborn heir of Scotland a nursery establishment entirely Scotch. Helen Little, the wife of Alexander Gray, burgess of Edinburgh, was "*maistress nureis*,"[2] and allowed, besides the company of Nanis Gray her daughter, the attendance of Helen Blyth her woman-servant, and Gilbert Ramsay her serving-man. The rockers were the Lady Kippenross, Jane Olyphant, Jane Crummy, Katherine Murray, and Christian Stewart, the daughter of the late Lord of Coldinghame, Mary's illegitimate brother; Alison Sinclair was the keeper of the royal infant's clothes. A band of violers was also early appointed, either as a piece of state, or to cultivate a taste for music in the boy.

As it was considered necessary to pay Queen Elizabeth the compliment of giving her the earliest possible intimation of the important event, Mary had caused a ceremonial letter to be prepared beforehand for that purpose, leaving a blank to be filled up either with Prince or Princess, whichever it might please God to grant her. Sir James Melville, who was appointed to be the bearer of this missive, has given so racy an account of his proceedings, and the royal spinster's reception of the news, that it would be unjust both to him and our readers not to relate it in his own words. "I was the first," he says, "that was advertised by the Lady Boyn, in her Majesty's name, to post with diligence the 19th day of June, in the year 1566, between ten and eleven before noon. It struck twelve when I took my horse, and I was at Berwick the same night." This was a marvellous exertion of speed in travelling, the usual resting-place for the night, either going or coming, in performing this journey, being Dunbar. "The fourth day after,"

[1] Superscribed, "To the Right Honorable Sir Wyllm Cicell, Knight, Principall Secretarye to the Q. Mate. Haste Hast. Hast."

[2] Chalmers, from the Erskine Archives.

continues Melville, "I was in London, and met first with my brother, who sent and advertised the Secretary Cecil that same night of my coming, and of the birth of the Prince, willing him to keep it up until my being at Court to show it myself unto her Majesty, who was for the time at *Grenwitch*, where her Majesty was in great merriness, and dancing after supper. But so soon as the Secretary Cecil sounded the news of the Prince's birth in her ear, all merriness was laid aside for that night, every one that were present marvelling what might move so sudden a changement, for the Queen sat her down, with her hand upon her *haffet* [her temple], and bursting out to some of her ladies, 'how that the Queen of Scotland was the mother of a fair son, and she but a barren stock.'"[1] This irrepressible surprise and mortification at the announcement of the safe delivery of her royal cousin, and that God had granted her the blessing of a living and lovely boy, has often been cited as a characteristic trait of the innate envy of Elizabeth's disposition; but it betrays also the fact that she, like others implicated in the late barbarous confederacy, had calculated on the probability of the death of both the mother and child, in consequence of the terror, agitation, and personal injuries Queen Mary had received on the dreadful evening of the 9th of March, during the butchery of her faithful servant in her presence.

"The next morning," continues Melville, "was appointed unto me to get audience, at what time my brother and I passed down the water by boat to Greenwich, and were met by some friends, that told us 'how sorrowful her Majesty was for my news, and what counsel she had gotten to show a glad countenance,' which she did in her best apparel, and said, 'that the joyful news of the Queen her sister's delivery of a fair son, which I had sent unto her by Mr Cecil, had delivered her out of a heavy sickness which had holden her fifteen days.' Therefore she welcomed me with a merry *volt*, and thanked me for the diligence I had used.' All this she said before I had delivered her my letter of credence. After that she had read it, I declared how that my

[1] Sir James Melville's Memoirs, Bannatyne Club edition, p. 158.

Queen had hasted me towards her Majesty, 'whom she knew of all her friends would be gladdest of the news of her birth, albeit dear bought with the peril of her life; for,' I said, 'she was so sair handled in the mean time, that she *wissed* never to have been married.'"[1] This pathetic representation of Mary's sufferings and regrets being only too true, our shrewd diplomatist considered it expedient to excuse himself for having made so plain an exposure of his Sovereign's wedded misery, observing that "he did so to scare Queen Elizabeth from venturing on the like thorny paths, as she sometimes boasted she would marry the Archduke Charles of Austria, Mary's rejected suitor," when asked to name a successor to her realm. "Then," continues Melville, "I requested her Majesty to be a gossip unto the Queen—for our *cummers* are called gossips in England—which she granted gladly to be. Then I said, 'her Majesty would have a fair occasion to see the Queen, which she had so oft desired.' At this she smiled, and said, 'she wished that her estate and affairs might permit her, and promised to send both honourable lords and ladies to supply her room.'" Melville, according to his instructions, mentioned Queen Mary's uneasiness on account of Morton and the other conspirators against her life continuing to reside in England; but Elizabeth, with shameless disregard to truth, "assured him on her honour that they had all departed out of her dominions." The birth of Mary's son had so greatly strengthened her party in England, that Melville ventured to solicit Elizabeth on the old subject of declaring the Queen of Scotland her heir. Though nothing could be more offensive to Elizabeth than such a requisition, she obligingly replied, "that the birth of the Prince of Scotland offered an additional incentive for her to direct her lawyers to search into the question of the claims to the regal succession, that she might come to a proper understanding as to who had the best right."[2]

Mary's remonstrances against the entertainment of her rebels were retaliated by complaints from Elizabeth, "that Mary encouraged her Irish insurgent O'Neal in Ireland,

[1] Sir James Melville's Memoirs, Bannatyne Club edition, p. 158. [2] Ibid.

and harboured a certain pestilent Papist, called Christopher Rokesby, who was stirring up sedition among persons of his own persuasion in the north of England." This was a deep stroke of diplomacy on Elizabeth's part, for Christopher Rokesby was a spy of her own. He had sought Mary's Court under the character of a Roman Catholic refugee, and had beguiled some of her English partisans of his own religion into giving him letters of recommendation to her trusty counsellor, Lesley, Bishop of Ross, as a person very fit to be employed in carrying on a secret correspondence with the families professing the like faith in the north of England. But Mary for some reason distrusted him. Finding this, Elizabeth, thinking by that means to establish him in the greater credit, pretended to be very jealous and angry at his being in Edinburgh, and instructed Killigrew to demand, as Mary had done of the Earl of Morton, that he should be arrested and sent back to her. Now Mary, having received a secret warning that Rokesby was in correspondence with Cecil, thought proper to comply with Elizabeth's request, and did arrest him; and more than that, for she caused his papers to be seized and scrutinised, and thus discovered Cecil's secret instructions in cipher, by which the whole web of deceit and falsehood was unravelled.[1] Rokesby, who was brought before Mary and her Council in her lying-in chamber, threw himself at her feet and confessed his guilt, beseeching her mercy, and offered to render her and her consort good and effectual service if she would only forgive and trust him.[2]

Mary inflicted no punishment on Rokesby, but drily sent word to Elizabeth "that she had complied with her request of arresting Rokesby, as she considered him an unworthy person, and had been confirmed in her previous bad opinion of him by examining his papers, and was ready and willing to deliver him up to her authorities, if she would send her instructions for that purpose." Mary was too prudent to enter into the particulars of her discoveries; for it

[1] Camden's Annals. MS. Letters in the State Paper Office.
[2] State Paper Office—Correspondence.

neither suited her to disoblige Cecil, nor yet to come to extremities with Elizabeth. Elizabeth took no notice of the northern Queen's communication in regard to her spy Rokesby, nor did she ever mention his name again, much less think of sending for him; so he was left on Mary's hands.[1] The peculiar service for which he had been sent to Scotland was to discover the names of Mary and Darnley's secret correspondents among the Roman Catholic nobility and gentry. These were so numerous and formidable that Melville declares "whole shires were devoted to Mary's interest, and ready to revolt against Elizabeth's authority on the first opportunity."

If the conjugal harmony that had been restored between Mary and her husband by the birth of their son could have remained unbroken—in other words, if his father, on the one hand, and her perfidious brother, the Earl of Moray, on the other, with the Douglas kindred, had not laboured successfully to tear open old wounds, and create new grudges, that unfortunate pair might have lived to unite in their own persons the threefold diadem of the Britannic empire. Unhappily a fresh quarrel broke out even before the Queen emerged from the seclusion of her lying-in chamber in Edinburgh Castle, in consequence of Darnley's political jealousy of Moray's power and importance in the state, and, above all, his influence over Mary's mind; for she, finding herself involved in a sea of difficulties, and having been accustomed to rely implicitly on her brother's counsel, had restored him to her favour and confidence as before. This was intolerable to Darnley, who had formed only too correct an estimate of Moray's views during his own fatal league with him and the other conspirators. Finding all his warning thrown away on the Queen, and that Moray's opinion always prevailed against his, he took great displeasure, and showed himself sullen and offended. One great cause of contention between Darnley and Moray was the conduct to be adopted with regard to Morton and the accomplices in Riccio's slaughter, Moray urging the Queen to publish

[1] State Paper Office—Correspondence.

an Act of Grace on account of the birth of the Prince, which Darnley vehemently opposed, declaring openly "they were in nowise to be trusted, from the experience he had had of their false disloyal practices, and knowing them to be without fear of God or pity towards men." As for Moray, their friend and confederate, "he distrusted," he said, "his very shadow."[1] At last he assured the Queen that "he saw no security for his own life, or her government, as long as Moray was in existence; that the death of such a traitor would be a public benefit, insuring the repose of the whole realm and the comfort of well-disposed people; for which reasons he had made up his mind to have him slain, as soon as opportunity might serve for the execution of his purpose." Terrified at this intimation, Mary indignantly reproved her husband for his wicked design and sanguinary disposition. "Are you not contented," said she, "with the murder of my Secretary, but you must dip your hands in my brother's blood, which, for the honour I bear the late King my father, I will by no means suffer, seeing I have always acknowledged him as his natural son; and albeit he be false and disloyal, have I not justice on my side to punish him according to law, instead of ridding him by a fate so cruel, forbidden alike by God and man?"[2]—sternly enjoining her husband, at the same time, "not to stain his honour by mentioning such evil thoughts to any one else," for well she knew that Moray's enemies were many and powerful. Huntley, for instance, who had the blood of a father and a brother to requite—Sutherland and Bothwell, who had long years of exile, and spoliation, and injurious accusations to avenge; nor were there wanting members of the rival house of Hamilton, who would have been only too eager to join Darnley in any project of the kind, for which the assassination of the Italian Secretary had afforded a fatal precedent. Notwithstanding the abhorrence Mary expressed at the idea of her husband carrying his design into execution, she had so much cause to suspect that he was, as indeed he assured her, "bent on doing

[1] Adam Blackwood's History of Mary Queen of Scots, p. 22. [2] Ibid.

it," that she considered herself under the necessity of warning Moray of his danger. For this act of sisterly compassion—or, it may be, womanly weakness—she has been severely vituperated by Buchanan; but surely she would have been much more blameworthy if she had contented herself with an unavailing remonstrance against the turpitude of the deed, and left the intended victim to his fate; for if Moray had been assassinated by her husband's procurement, she, having foreknowledge of the purpose meditated, could neither have been absolved by God or man of a share in the guilt.

Never, perhaps, was either Queen or woman placed in a more painful position. She was perfectly aware that her brother had sinned frequently against her, but she had forgiven him, and fondly imagined he would now be bound to her—as Melville and Throckmorton had assured her he would—by gratitude, to love and serve her more faithfully than if he had never offended. "But the leopard changeth not his spots;" and it must be acknowledged that the rash, unreflective Darnley understood the character of Moray somewhat better than the Queen, not being, like her, blinded by affection. Mark how she was requited.

In the journal subsequently fabricated by Moray to misrepresent his royal sister's proceedings at this time, for the purpose of bolstering up his false accusations against her, and presented by him to Queen Elizabeth at Westminster, he states "that July 20th, or thereabouts, Queen Mary fled the King's company, and past by boat with the pirates to Alloa, where the King coming, was repulsed."[1] What will the reader say to the fact that Moray and his Countess were themselves of this piratical party, and that Alloa, the haven to which the Queen and her company were proceeding up the Forth, was the baronial mansion of his uncle the Earl of Mar, who had been, as we have shown, the Queen's preceptor, and was, with Lady Mar, the state governess of the Prince, also on board the vessel, as well as the Earl and Countess of Argyll, the Queen's ladies, and

[1] Anderson's Collections.

the members of the Privy Council?[1] But in order to show how far misrepresentation of facts so simple, so innocent, and so public withal, can go, it will be proper to proceed with Buchanan's shameless version of poor Mary's state voyage to Alloa Castle. "The Queen," says he, "fearing, as it were, lest her favour to the Earl of Bothwell should not be sufficiently manifested, once on a day, very early in the morning, with only one or two attendants, passed down to Newhaven, and, without letting any mortal know whither she was hurrying, went on board a small vessel that lay there in readiness. It had been prepared by William and Edmund Blackaders, Edward Robertson, and Thomas Dickson, all of them dependants on the Earl of Bothwell, and pirates notorious for rapacity. With this retinue of robbers, to the astonishment of all good men, she put out to sea, without taking with her so much as one of her servants of higher rank; and in Alloa Castle,[2] where the ship arrived, she demeaned herself for some days as if she had forgot not only royal dignity, but even the modesty of the matron."[3]

The facts were these: The Queen remained in Edinburgh Castle, as the dates of the Privy Seal registers and the minutes of the Privy Council prove, till the 27th of July, when, having been ordered by her physicians to refresh herself with change of air, she consented to honour her old preceptor, the Earl of Mar, the captain of Edinburgh Castle, and his Countess, with a visit at their country seat. Instead of fleeing thither to avoid her husband, she had, by appointing Mauvissière the French ambassador's state reception to take place there, for delivering the letters of congratulation from the King and royal family of France to her and Darnley on the birth of the Prince, rendered his presence indispensable at the Court to be holden at Alloa Castle for that purpose. But Darnley refused to enter the same vessel with Moray and his coadjutors, with whom he

[1] Goodall's Enquiry. Chalmers' Life of Mary Queen of Scots.

[2] Alloa is situated between Stirling and Edinburgh: it was anciently spelt Alloway.

[3] Detection of Mary Stuart, by George Buchanan, in Anderson's Collections. See also his History of Scotland, vol. ii. p. 314.

was at variance, and chose to perform the journey by land. If Bothwell were on board the royal vessel, it was only in accordance with his duty as Lord-Admiral of Scotland; but the Earl of Bedford's letters afford substantial reason to believe he was fully occupied on the Borders, then in a very unsettled state.

Even the natural and innocent questions Mary asked about the ropes and navigation of the royal vessel, as she proceeded on her voyage, are treated by her malignant defamer Buchanan as proofs of her unqueenly manners and inordinate affection for Bothwell: [1] so little grounds had her conduct afforded for reproach, and so difficult was it, without the grossest misrepresentation, to get up a case against her. As to the early hour of her embarkation, it is scarcely necessary to observe that it must have been when the tide served. Their Majesties sat in council at Alloa Castle the day after their arrival (July 28th), and published a proclamation, then and there agreed between them, "convening their lords, barons, freeholders, and other substantious persons in the southern shires, to meet them at Peebles on the 13th of August, furnished in warlike manner, to support them in their purpose of a justiciary progress through the realm, beginning at the Borders." [2]

Buchanan pretends "that the King followed Mary to Alloa by land, having scarcely got a few hours allowed him for his servants to refresh themselves; but, as a troublesome disturber of her pleasures, was commanded to return to the place from whence he came." [3] But there is the evidence of many charters, executed by their Majesties at Alloa, both under the Great Seal and the Privy Seal, with their regal signatures, to prove they were together there from the 28th of July to the 31st, when they went back to Edinburgh for two nights on some especial business, and returned to Alloa Castle on the 2d of August.[4]

[1] Detection of Mary Stuart, by George Buchanan.
[2] Records of the Privy Council.
[3] Detection of Mary Stuart, by George Buchanan.
[4] Goodall and Chalmers, from the Registers.

One of the much misrepresented occupations of Queen Mary, during her first brief visit to Alloa, was listening to the complaints of the poor and oppressed. Nor did she disdain to exert her personal influence in their behalf, where the case was such as to preclude her from interposing her regal power for the redress of their wrongs. The following royal letter, lately discovered in the charter-chest of the Laird of Abercairnie, proves that she benevolently pleaded the cause of a distressed widow, who had been, with her children, ejected by their landlord from their humble home, and their goods distrained. With such a document before us, to bear witness of the manner in which this Princess, of whom the age was not worthy, was occupying her time and attention at Alloa, when shamelessly represented by the some-time monk Buchanan, and his suborner, the Prior-Earl of Moray, as associated with pirates and robbers in guilty and licentious practices, it is difficult to refrain from replying to their slanders, "I tell ye, churlish priests, a ministering angel shall sweet Mary be, while ye lie howling!" where all false witnesses are promised their portion.

"To our traist friend, Robert Murray of Aberkearne.

"30th July 1566.

"Traist Freind,—Forasmeikle as it is heavily moaned and piteously complained by this puir woman, that ye have violently ejected her, with *ane* company of puir bairnies, forth of her kindly home, ever willing to pay you duty thankfully; therefore, in respect that if ye be so extreme as to *depauperate* the puir woman and her bairns, we will desire you to show some favour, and accept them in their *steeting* (?), as ye have done in times bygone; the which we doubt not but ye will do for this our request, and as ye shall respect our thanks and pleasure for the same.

"At *Alway* [Alloa], the penult of July 1566. Marie R."[1]

This is also worthy of observation, as a specimen of the peculiar kind of documents executed by Mary in her separate person, without the co-operation of her husband.

Mauvissière, the French ambassador, was charged, in his instructions by his own Court, to ascertain the pleasure of Queen Mary as to the manner in which he was to demean

[1] From the original inedited document in the charter-chest of William Moray Stirling, Esq. of Abercairnie and Ardoch; communicated by the late Alexander Macdonald, Esq., of the Register House, Edinburgh.

himself to Darnley, and by no means to deliver separate letters of congratulation to him, as King of Scotland, if she objected.[1] Mary was desirous that all marks of ceremonial respect should be paid to her husband, and the father of her child, by her royal kindred. She employed Mauvissière to mediate a reconciliation between Darnley and her nobles, and to endeavour to soothe him into a milder temper.[2] But the effect produced by the ambassador's good offices was very brief. Moray and the Earl of Atholl earnestly solicited the Queen to pardon Lethington, and restore his estates. This measure was vehemently opposed by Darnley, who told the Queen that Lethington was the vilest of traitors; and having been guilty of "yon foul fact," as he emphatically termed the assassination of Riccio, "he ought never again to be permitted to enter her presence."[3] But Moray, taking advantage of Darnley's occasional disregard to truth, persuaded the Queen "that he only spoke from passion and prejudice, for that Lethington had always been very much her friend, and was perfectly innocent of any share in the murder, as he supped that night in Atholl's apartment." Mary was, therefore, in evil hour both for her husband and herself, induced to grant this subtle traitor full and free remission for all offences, real or imputed, and to admit him to her presence on the 2d of August at Alloa Castle. Darnley, regarding this as an outrageous violation of her conjugal obedience, manifested great displeasure; angry scenes ensued, followed by coldness and reserve on Mary's part. It was at this period that Bedford writes his gossipping and evidently exaggerated reports of their matrimonial discord, imputing, of course, all the blame thereof to Mary, whom it was his especial business to calumniate in his news-letters to the English Court;[4] although, if ever she acted in accordance with the wishes of him and his colleagues, it must have been then, seeing that she had resigned herself entirely to the guidance of their secret-service man, Moray: and this was the true cause of her husband's discontent.

[1] Labanoff, vol. i. [2] Chalmers' Life of Queen Mary. [3] Ibid.
[4] Bedford to Cecil, Aug. 3d and 8th—State Paper MSS.

The royal pair agreed well together two days after their return from Alloa; but after Moray's arrival in Edinburgh, fresh discord, as might naturally be expected, was engendered.[1] The Lairds of Brunston and Elveson, and the Justice-Clerk, in spite of Darnley's opposition, were pardoned and restored, and the Queen was urged to extend her grace to others whom he denounced as art and part in the late treason. If he were displeased at Mary's misplaced clemency to the villains who induced him, by plotting against her, to shipwreck his own happiness, and defeat his own ambitious hopes, his animosity against Moray, through whose superior policy he found himself worsted in every contest for the mastery in the Queen's Councils, was of course greatly increased. Unable to subdue or conceal his indignation, and perceiving full well the perfidious game Moray was playing, he expressed himself in the bitterest terms, and again protested his determination of ridding himself of the insolent rivalry of the bastard. Mary having always the example of Riccio's assassination present to her mind, and dreading that a tragedy still more revolting to her would be perpetrated by her vindictive consort, once more warned her brother that the King bore him evil mind, and threatened his life. This was no secret, for Darnley had not confined his confidence on that subject to the Queen: his hatred to Moray was matter of public notoriety. Under these circumstances it was considered advisable for Moray to remonstrate with him in the presence of the Queen and some others. Darnley neither could nor did deny the charge, but said "he understood Moray was not his friend, which made him say and do that which he otherwise would not have thought of;" on which the Queen observed, "that she could not be content that either he or any other should be unfriend to my Lord of Moray."[2] Darnley, considering himself aggrieved by this intimation, withdrew, first to Dunfermline, and then took possession of Morton's pleasant house at Dalkeith, where Buchanan pretends "he was forced to abide after the birth of the Prince"—a palpable mistake, for, as he returned from

[1] Advices from the Earl of Bedford out of Scotland. [2] Ibid.

Alloa on the 4th of August, and agreed well with the Queen two days, their separation could not have occurred before the 7th of August, and they were again together in Edinburgh on the 12th: he could not have spent many days, therefore, at Dalkeith, and those entirely to please himself.[1]

No sooner had Mary's irritable consort withdrawn than she was compelled to listen to a fierce altercation between Moray and Bothwell on the subject of the abbey-lands of Haddington, which, in the persuasion of Lethington's guilty implication in the late treason, she had transferred from him to Bothwell. But Moray, having asserted Lethington's innocence, insisted that these should be restored to him; while Bothwell not only pleaded the Queen's grant to himself, but his own superior claim as the representative of the Lords of Hailes and Crichton, the original patrons of that fair ecclesiastical domain, as reasons for refusing to relinquish them. Moray said "Lethington would consent to a division, of which he and Sir James Balfour had undertaken to be the umpires." When Bothwell understood the portion these self-appointed arbitrators had assigned to Lethington, he stoutly replied, "Ere I part with those lands I will part with my life;" to which Moray rejoined, "Twenty as honest men as you shall lose their lives ere Lethington be reft."[2]

The Queen, poor powerless puppet in Moray's hands, listened to the dispute in silence, without once attempting to vindicate her exercise of her regal prerogative in regard to the transfer of her contested gift to Bothwell. Let, therefore, the evidence of the facts decide whether the influence of Moray or of Bothwell were the greatest at this period, when the former was able to carry his point in favour of his guilty confederate Lethington, against the opposition of Darnley and Bothwell both, and to menace Bothwell before her very face in language insulting to her, since it was not Bothwell who had "reft Lethington of the lands of Haddington," but Mary herself. What further inference is to be drawn from this incident, hitherto unnoticed by the historians of Mary Stuart? What but the

[1] Chalmers.
[2] Advices from Scotland from the Earl of Bedford, in State Paper Office.

simple and self-evident truth that she was virtually under her brother's coercive guidance, from the moment she took her chamber in Edinburgh Castle till the deeply-laid schemes for her ruin were fulfilled?

Bothwell, after the intimation he had received from Moray in the presence of the Queen, that his life would not be safe if he persisted in detaining her gift of the abbey-lands of Haddington from the rival claimant Lethington, prudently withdrew from a sphere where his unscrupulous antagonist possessed full power to make his boast good.[1] Yet this is the time when Bothwell is represented by Knox and Buchanan as residing in Edinburgh, and exercising despotic authority over the Queen and her realm. Mary and Darnley sent, on the 12th of August, letters requiring him and the Sheriff of Selkirk to make the necessary arrangements for the royal hunting in Meggetland, a wild district in Peeblesshire, bordering on Ettrick Forest.[2] Mary hoped that the pleasurable excitement of sylvan sports, of which Darnley was very fond, would amuse his mind and divert his restless excitability; but unfortunately some of the daring forest outlaws had been there before them, and swept off the game, so that they had little pastime. In consequence of their disappointment, their Majesties held a Council at Roddonno, August 10th, to enforce a greater strictness in the preservation of their deer. On the 19th they honoured Lord Traquair with a visit at his house of Traquair, where they hunted together and passed the night, and returned to Edinburgh on the 20th.[3] This was a State progress, and they were attended by the Marchmont herald, who received forty shillings for his fee. After two days' sojourn in Edinburgh, they proceeded to Stirling, carrying with them the Prince, whom they left at Stirling Castle,[4] while they went into the hunting forests of Perthshire. They arrived at Drummond Castle August 30th, and after spending one night in that splendid abode of feudal hospitality, returned to Stirling. In the course of this pompous

[1] Advices from Scotland from the Earl of Bedford, in State Paper Office. [2] Chalmers' Notes.
[3] Goodall. Chalmers, from the Privy Council Records. [4] Ibid.

tour they honoured the Laird of Menteith with a visit, and Mary beheld once more, under feelings, alas, how changed!

> "Those scenes, beloved in vain,
> Where once her careless childhood strayed,
> A stranger then to pain."

Buchanan, without adducing any facts, accuses the Queen "of behaving coyly, disdainfully, and presumptuously to her husband during these hunts;" if so, they must have been together, which is incompatible with his other statements "that Darnley was forced to abide at Dalkeith, and afterwards to remain at Stirling, that he might be no interruption to the Queen's pleasures." The wedded life of Mary and Darnley was, however, a series of quarrels and reconciliations; and according to the evidence of a Protestant prelate, Dr Parkhurst, Bishop of Norwich, they were at this period living in unwonted harmony. The following extract from his letter to Bullinger shows withal the alarm caused by Mary's religion:—

"The Queen of Scotland has brought forth a Prince; and whereas heretofore she had no great regard for her husband, I know not for what reason, she is now on the best of terms with him. While I was writing the above, a certain Scottish refugee—a good and learned man—has informed me that the Queen was brought to bed ten weeks since, but that the child is not yet baptised. On my asking him the reason, he replied, 'The Queen will have her son baptised in the High Church, with many masses. But the people of Edinburgh will not allow this, for they would rather die than suffer the detested mass to insinuate itself into their churches. They are afraid, however, of her calling over auxiliary troops from France, that she may the more easily overwhelm the Gospellers.' She ordered some pious nobleman to turn Knox, who was residing with him, out of his house. May the Lord either convert or confound her!"[1]

Written Aug. 22, 1566.

It was not, however, Mary, but her husband, who wanted to have masses in St Giles's Church, on which he had set his mind ever since he had been insulted at the Protestant sermon there, in the preceding August, by John Knox. Mary was at this time on very good terms with the Established Church of Scotland, and had given favourable answers to all the supplications addressed to her in the name of the General Assembly by their minister Craig, save their

[1] Bishop Parkhurst of Norwich to Henry Bullinger—Zurich Letters, First Series, pp. 165, 166.

request for her to dispense with the mass in her Chapel-royal. Her policy, as regarded religion, was far too enlightened and liberal to please her wrong-headed consort, who, though he had for political purposes occasionally yoked himself in deceitful fellowship with the Lords of the Congregation, was inflamed with such furious zeal for the restoration of the Romish Church in Scotland, that, says Knox, "by the advice of foolish *cagots*[1] he wrote to the Pope, to the King of Spain, and to the King of France, complaining of the state of the country, which was all out of order, all because that mass and Popery were not again erected, giving the whole blame thereof to the Queen as not managing the Catholic cause aright. 'By some knave,' continues the great reformer, "this poor Prince was betrayed, and the Queen got a copy of these letters into her hands, and therefore threatened him sore, and there was never after that any appearance of love between them."[2] If Mary had been detected in complaining to the Pope and other foreign Sovereigns of Darnley's tolerance to Protestants, and lukewarmness in regard to the interests of the Church of Rome, in what terms, may we ask, would Knox have recorded the fact? Zeal against Popery is the general excuse for his ill manners and disloyal conduct to his young Sovereign, but here his personal hatred to her betrays him into inconsistent sympathy with her bigoted husband, who was accusing her of slackness in its cause, and blaming her that the mass was not again erected in Scotland!

Darnley's secret correspondence with the Pope, and his restless intrigues for the disturbance of the Reformed Church of Scotland, are corroborated by a curious passage in Richard Bannatyne's Memorials, who, some years after the death of that Prince, mentions "that among the spoils which fell into the hands of the Scotch peasants who plundered the unfortunate Earl of Northumberland's baggage, was the very money sent from the Pope by one Jacquestea, an Englishman, secretary to *umquhill* Harry our King, to suppress Christ Jesus in Scotland; but the ship brake, Jacquestea was

[1] Cagot is a French term for an outlawed race, considered idiotic.
[2] History of the Reformation in Scotland.

drowned, and the said Earl gripped the gold."[1] The date of Jacquestea's mission would have supplied an important link in the tangled chain of Darnley's annals, but the inference is, that he must have been the bearer of the letters to the Pope mentioned by Knox, containing complaints of Mary's lukewarmness in the cause of her own Church. The headlong zeal of Darnley, and his repeated declarations "that he would not rest till he had the mass in St Giles's Church again," afforded, of course, cogent reason to the great lay impropriators of the church-lands, in addition to his declared hostility against the majority of them, for their persevering confederacy against his life.

[1] Bannatyne's Memorials, p. 3.

MARY STUART

CHAPTER XXIV.

SUMMARY

Queen Mary at Stirling with her husband—Her Council require her presence in Edinburgh—She requests her husband to accompany her—He refuses—She goes to Edinburgh alone—Returns to fetch Darnley—He still refuses to quit Stirling—French ambassador, Du Croc, meets the Queen at Stirling—Flourishing state of Mary's son—Perversities of Darnley—His unpopularity and discontent—His hatred of Moray and three of the Queen's ladies—Queen returns to Edinburgh without him—Darnley's purpose to leave Scotland—His father writes to tell the Queen so—Her perplexity and distress—Darnley arrives at Holyrood House—Refuses to come in—Objects to three of the Lords—Queen goes out to meet him—Persuades him to pass the night at Holyrood—His sullen reserve—Intends to go back to Stirling—Refuses to tell her the cause of his displeasure—Queen assembles her Council next morning, to inquire the reason of his discontent—Questions him in their presence—His obdurate demeanour—Admits there is no fault in the Queen, but leaves her unkindly—The Council try to console the Queen—Their high testimony to her virtues and good conduct—Darnley writes to the Queen, and states his grievances—Her reply—Darnley's hatred to the murderers of David Riccio—Evidences of Mary's affection for her husband.

MARY remained at Stirling with her husband and their child till the 11th of September, when the Privy Council sent to request her to come to Edinburgh, to attend to business which could not be transacted without her personal presence. She wished Darnley to accompany her, but he told her "he preferred remaining where he was," and she reluctantly proceeded to Edinburgh without him.[1] Finding, at the end of a week, that the affairs then under considera-

[1] Letter of the Lords of the Privy Council, Moray, Lethington, &c., to the Queen-mother of France—Keith, 349.

tion would detain her longer than was at first expected, she determined to make another effort to induce her wayward consort to take up his abode with her at Holyrood.[1] It is scarcely necessary to observe, that if she had been employing herself in the way Buchanan and her other libellers state, she would neither have been uneasy at her husband's absence, nor condescended to take such pains to procure his society. She returned to Stirling September 21st, and was there joined by the new French ambassador, Monsieur Du Croc, a wise and venerable man, who reports very highly to his own Court of her virtuous and prudent conduct at this trying period. He speaks also of the healthy and flourishing state of the infant Prince, her son, then three months old, and so fat and fine for his age "that, by the time of his christening, his godfathers," observes his Excellency, "will feel the weight of bearing him in their arms."[2] Very pleasant letters arrived from the King and Queen-mother of France on the 22d, by Lord Seton, whom Mary had sent with her request—to which Darnley, as we have seen, had added his—that the King would send some distinguished nobleman to represent him as the sponsor of the infant heir of Scotland.

Mary only remained at Stirling two nights, being compelled to return to Edinburgh again for despatch of business on the 23d—business, too, regarding the arrangements for the national fêtes she was desirous of giving in honour of the baptism of her son. She had vainly endeavoured to borrow money from Cardinal de Lorraine and the King of France for this purpose, and therefore found it necessary to solicit a pecuniary aid from her nobles, whom she had convened in Edinburgh. Darnley was obdurate to all her entreaties for him to accompany her to Holyrood; and as he chose to remain at Stirling, she induced Du Croc to stay with him for a few days, to endeavour to reason him into a better mind.[3]

Interesting and important information connected with the proceedings of Mary and her husband at this crisis, is afforded by Du Croc, in a confidential letter to the

[1] Chalmers. [2] Du Croc to Beton, Archbishop of Glasgow. [3] Ibid.

Queen-mother of France. After mentioning how agreeable to Mary was the appointment of the Count de Brienne to act as proxy for the King of France, he says, "Great preparations are making for the said baptism, and the Lords here are putting themselves in grand order in contemplation of performing their devoir well and suitably on that occasion, those of that religion as well as the Catholics: and I must tell you that both the Lords who are here, and those who are in correspondence with the King and your Majesty, are so well reconciled together with the Queen, through her wise conduct, that now I cannot perceive a single division. But if the Queen and these Lords are well together, the King her husband is as ill, both with the one side and the other; nor can it be otherwise, according to the manner in which he deports himself, for he wants to be all in all, and the paramount governor of everything, and for that end he puts himself in the way of being nothing. He often bewails himself to me; and one day I told him, 'that if he would do me the honour of informing me what it was he complained of in the Queen and the nobles, I would take the liberty of mentioning it to them.' He said, as he has often done, 'that he wished to return to the same state he was in when he first married.' I assured him 'he could never return to that, and if he had found himself well off then, it behoved him to have kept so; that he must perceive that the Queen, having been outraged in her person, could never reinstate him in the authority he had before; and that he ought to be very well contented with the honours and benefits she gave him in treating him as King-consort, and supplying him and his household very liberally with all things requisite.'"[1]

As a proof of the truth of this assertion, and consequently a refutation of the mistakes of Knox, who, speaking from hearsay and the reports of inimical tale-bearers, says "the King was destitute of such things as were necessary for him," and Buchanan's fictions that he was often in absolute want, it must be mentioned that the Treasurer's records bear abundant evidence that his Majesty's orders, both for

[1] Labanoff, vol. i. 374-5.

money to himself and payment for articles furnished for his use, were duly answered. On two days—August 13th and August 31st, 1566—the Treasurer, by the joint order of the King and Queen, supplied him with articles amounting to three hundred pounds, a larger sum than had been expended in her own personal outlay by the Queen during the last six months.[1] The conversation between Darnley and Du Croc at Stirling clearly explains that, before the attempt to supplant Mary in her regal office, he had exercised the functions of joint Sovereign with her, but was reduced, after Riccio's assassination had terrified Mary into putting herself into the hands of Moray and his powerful faction for protection, to the inferior position of King-consort, and excluded from all share in the government—for which, in truth, his violent and headstrong temper and intemperate habits completely unfitted him. His pride was severely mortified by the contempt with which both parties treated him, which he attributed not to his own misconduct, but to the loss of political importance, and the superior respect paid to Moray's opinion both by the Queen and the Council. He insisted much on his marital authority, and considered that the Queen ought to render him conjugal obedience in affairs of state, and submit to his will, instead of permitting herself to be ruled by her illegitimate brother, who at that time exercised the functions of Prime Minister, having succeeded in reinstating Lethington in his previous office of Secretary of State, and filling the Council and Cabinet with a majority of his own creatures and confederates. This was the cause of Darnley's sullen and repulsive behaviour to the Queen, whom he desired to punish for not succumbing to his pleasure in the choice of her ministers, although he ought to have been aware that, by recalling Moray and his confederates without her consent or knowledge, he had been the means of placing her in a position that left her no choice in the matter.

[1] Exchequer Records in the General Register House, Edinburgh. Chalmers' Life of Queen Mary, p. 186.

There were then two factions in Scotland—one was headed by Moray, the other by Bothwell. Between these the Queen might have held the balance of power, if she had been faithfully supported by her husband and his father, but she was traversed and impeded by the selfish ambition of the one, and the insane jealousy and querulousness of the other. "He cannot bear," observes one of Bedford's spies, speaking of Darnley, "that the Queen should use familiarity either with man or woman, especially the ladies of Argyll, Mar, and Moray, who keep most company with her."[1] These three ladies were, the sister of Moray, his uncle's wife, and his own, and being regarded by Darnley as the bedchamber clique, who assisted in keeping up his hated rival Moray's influence with the Queen, were the peculiar objects of his dislike. As Lady Mar was a matron of the highest respectability, the wife of the Queen's old preceptor, it ought to be regarded as a strong argument of Mary's prudence that she was on terms of intimate friendship with her; as also of her amiable and forgiving nature, that she could restore Lady Moray to her favour so soon after she had been convicted of receiving the secret-service money of England from Randolph's agent, to assist her husband in his ungrateful rebellion. It may be observed, that no exceptions were ever made by Darnley against Lady Reres, of whose intimacy with the Queen, Buchanan has invented so many absurd tales.

Mary returned to Edinburgh, September 23d, having been reluctantly compelled to leave her husband in his sullen mood at Stirling. Her business in Edinburgh was to attend a convention of the nobles, who met for despatch of business during the season of the vacations. These took place then, as now, in August, and lasted till St Martin's Day in November.

As soon as the Queen was gone, Darnley told Du Croc "that he intended to go abroad, as he felt himself in a state of despair." Du Croc knew not how to believe he was in earnest, but said whatever appeared proper to dissuade him

[1] Advertisements out of Scotland from the Earl of Bedford, State Paper Office MS.—Robertson's Appendix.

from so absurd and impolitic a step.[1] Darnley had confided his intention of leaving Scotland to his father, who highly disapproved of it; and having vainly, by letters and messages, endeavoured to shake his determination, took the opportunity of the Queen's absence to visit and remonstrate with him on his folly, but in vain. They appear even to have parted in anger; for Lennox left him and returned to Glasgow, his usual abiding-place, whence he wrote to inform the Queen "that he found his son had made up his mind to leave the realm, and had got a ship ready to convey him beyond seas; that he had said all he could to alter his determination, but finding he had not sufficient influence to induce him to change his obstinate purpose, he besought her Majesty to take it in hand, and try what she could do."[2]

The Queen received this letter on the morning of Michaelmas day, scarcely six days after she had parted with her perverse husband at Stirling. If he had been an object of indifference to her, his intention of leaving her would have been so also. If, as pretended by their mutual enemies, she had regarded him with such unconquerable aversion that his presence was repugnant to her, she would naturally have rejoiced in the prospect of his absenting himself from her without involving her in the slightest unpopularity. Disobliging and mischievous as he was, almost any other princess, under the circumstances, would have either banished or imprisoned him for life; but Mary loved him, as he knew full well, and therefore he threatened to afflict her by his desertion. Struck with consternation at the idea of losing him, yet probably mistrusting the quarter whence the information proceeded—for Mary regarded her father-in-law as the author of all her matrimonial infelicity—she lost no time in imparting her trouble to the Lords of her Council, and requesting their advice. As these were the men who, a few months later, sought to brand Mary with the imputation of every crime that could infame a wife, degrade

[1] Du Croc to the Archbishop of Glasgow.
[2] Ibid., and letter to the Queen-mother of France. Letter of Mary's Council to ditto.

a Queen, and disgrace a woman, we must, in justice to her, proceed with the narrative in their own words, since, fortunately for Mary, they employed the eloquent pen of Lethington to draw up their official record of the proceedings of the royal pair, as well as their own, speaking of themselves in the third person.[1] "If her Majesty were surprised by this advertisement from the Earl of Lennox, these Lords were no less astonished to understand that the King—who may justly esteem himself happy on account of the honour the Queen has been pleased to confer upon him, and whose chief aim should be to render himself grateful for her bounty, and behave himself honourably and dutifully towards her—should entertain any thought of departing, after so strange a manner, out of her presence; nor was it possible for them to form a conjecture from whence such an imagination could proceed. Their Lordships, therefore, took a resolution to talk with the King, that they might learn from himself the occasion of this hasty determination of his, *if* such he had." This parenthesis seems to imply a doubt of Lennox's statement; and surely his conduct and character were such as to justify a suspicion that it might be merely an attempt to gain some political advantage for his son, by playing on the Queen's conjugal tenderness, "which," he had before observed in confidence to these very men, "was the best way of managing her."[2] "The same evening the King came to Edinburgh, but made some difficulty to enter the Palace, by reason that three or four Lords"—two of these, we know, were Moray and Lethington, the authors of the narrative—"were with the Queen, and peremptorily insisted 'that they should be dismissed before he would condescend to come in;' which deportment appeared to be very unreasonable, since they were three of the greatest Lords of the kingdom; and those Kings who were by birth Sovereigns of the realm have never treated the nobles in that fashion. The Queen conducted herself as well as it was possible to do; she even went herself to meet and receive the King without the

[1] Their statement is satisfactorily verified by the letters of Du Croc to Beton, Archbishop of Glasgow, and to the Queen-mother of France.

[2] Letter of the Lords of the Council to the Queen-mother of France—Keith, p. 348.

Palace, and led him into her own apartment, where he remained all night."

The time of his arrival, according to Monsieur Du Croc, was ten o'clock at night. "When he and the Queen were in bed together, her Majesty took occasion to talk to him about the contents of his father's letter, and besought him to declare to her the reason of his intended voyage; but in this he would by no means satisfy her."[1] Thus Du Croc and the Lords of the Council agree in their testimony of the amiable and conciliatory deportment of the Queen to her sullen boy-husband, proving that it was not till the next morning, after she had vainly wooed him in their hours of conjugal privacy to unfold the cause of his threatened desertion of her and their infant son, that, as a last resource, and in her own justification, she requested the assistance and mediation of her Council in discussing the matter with him, in the presence of his friend and confidant Du Croc. How, then, can Monsieur Mignet do Mary the injustice of omitting the above interesting instance of her wifely patience and tenderness, and relate the circumstance so differently from the authorities to which he refers, stating, "that as soon as Darnley arrived the Queen assembled her Council, sent for Du Croc, and in their presence demanded an explanation of her consort, who, having come to seek an amicable interview, was struck dumb with amazement, as well he might have been, at such a reception,"[2]—a reception so different from that which she gave him.

But let the Lords of the Council, who surely knew best, bear witness of the time, place, and manner of their assem-

[1] Letter of M. Du Croc to the Archbishop of Glasgow, in Keith.

[2] After the above startling instance of the inaccuracy of our accomplished French contemporary, it is scarcely necessary to reply to the reviewer who inquires "wherefore we have ignored M. Mignet's Life of Mary Stuart?" that we consider it safer to quote from the documents themselves, than to be the means of perpetuating error by repeating the misstatements of a modern author, whose work, however elegantly written, is so far from supplying any additional materials for the biography of Mary Stuart, that it is only calculated to mislead the ignorant by misrepresenting her actions, even in the face of such well-authenticated evidence as the letters of Du Croc, and corroborated by the official narrative of the Lords of the Privy Council, whose testimony in favour of their royal mistress can scarcely be impugned, since they were eyewitnesses of the transaction, and anything but friends to her, as their subsequent conduct proves.

bling to discuss the matter with the wayward consort of their Sovereign. "The next day, very early in the morning, having understood that he was already about to depart on his return to Stirling, the Lords of the Council came, and found him in the Queen's chamber, no one being there but those who have the honour to be of their Majesties' Council, and M. Du Croc, whom they entreated to be present, and to assist them."[1] "Early next morning," says Du Croc himself, "the Queen sent for me, and for all the Lords and other Councillors. As we were all met in their Majesties' presence, the Bishop of Ross, by the Queen's desire, declared to the Council the King's intention to go beyond sea, for which purpose he had a ship lying ready to sail; and that her Majesty's information proceeded not from the rumour of the town, but from a letter written to her by his own father, the Earl of Lennox, which letter was read in the Council. And thereafter the Queen 'prayed the King to declare, in the presence of the Lords, and before me, the reason of his projected departure, since he would not be pleased to notify the same to her in private between themselves.' She likewise took his hand, and besought him, 'for God's sake, to declare whether she had given him any occasion for this resolution,' begging him 'to speak plainly, and not to spare her.'"[2]

The Lords of the Council addressed him with great humility, and told him "that the cause of their coming was to inquire the reason of his intended voyage, and to ask for what end he proposed, and if it were for any cause of disgust: if so," they begged him "to state his grievances, and to name those from whom they proceeded; for if from any who were subjects in that realm, the fault should be repaired, and all proper satisfaction given." As he continued obstinately silent, they represented to him "the injury he would do himself, and the contempt he would put on the Queen, if he withdrew from a country where he had received so much honour, and abandoned the company of her to

[1] Letter of the Lords of the Council to the Queen-mother of France—M. Teulet's Pièces et Documens. Keith.

[2] Du Croc to the Archbishop of Glasgow—Keith, p. 346.

whom he was so greatly obliged, who, being his Sovereign, had condescended to make him her consort; that he would be condemned by all the world as an ingrate, and unthankful for the love her Majesty bore him, and considered unworthy of filling the place to which she had elevated him. But if, on the other hand, he thought he had cause to justify him in doing it, it ought to be something very serious which could incline him to leave so beautiful a Queen and so fair a realm, if so the fault must either be in her Majesty or her Council." "As for us," continued the Lords, "we are ready to submit ourselves in everything reasonable; and as for her Majesty, it was impossible that she could have given him cause for discontent, but, on the contrary, he had all the reason in the world to praise God for having given him a wife so wise and virtuous as she has shown herself in all her actions."[1]

Let it be distinctly remembered that this testimony to Mary's stainless integrity and discreet conduct as a wife, and that it was impossible that she could have given just cause of offence to her husband, is from the pen of Lethington, attested by Moray and the rest of the Privy Council as having been verbally made in the presence of Darnley himself, who could not and did not contradict it. We then ask what credit is to be given to the charges brought against this unfortunate Princess a few months later by the same men? "At this time," says Moray's fabricated journal, "the King coming from Stirling was repulsed with chiding."[2] It is needless to observe, that this falsehood was devised to deprive the Queen of the credit due to her for her gentle and forbearing conduct on the above occasion. The fact of Darnley coming to Holyrood at ten o'clock on the night of September 29th, and leaving Edinburgh precipitately early the next morning, would naturally tell against her with those who only saw the external aspect of things, and could have had no opportunity of witnessing the royal wife's plead-

[1] Letter of the Lords of Queen Mary's Privy Council, from the French copy printed in Teulet's Pièces et Documens, vol. ii. p. 144. See also, as more accessible, the translated copy in Keith, p. 349.

[2] Anderson's Collections.

ing earnestness with her perverse consort, when she came into the cold evening air, and stood patiently without her Palace gates reasoning with his childish folly, and courting him to enter, desisting not from her endearing suit till she had with gentle force led him into her own bower of love. Many an ill-yoked gentlewoman has had to submit to hard trials of wifely forbearance, but Mary Stuart was surely the only Sovereign Princess in the world who would thus have condescended to the ungrateful creature of her bounty. Surrounded as she then was by men whose enmity he had provoked, it would have been an easy thing for her to have ordered him under an arrest, and confined him to his own apartment till he was in a more reasonable frame of mind, or understood his position in Scotland better. For he had sworn allegiance to Mary as his Sovereign Lady, and his kingly title, derived solely from her favour and proclamation, having never been recognised by her Parliament, was perfectly illegal; he therefore stood amenable not only to her, but to the Three Estates of Scotland, for the grave offence of having discharged the Parliament contrary to the laws of the realm by his own authority, as well as coercing her Majesty's person, and detaining her as a prisoner, besides all the minor but positive acts of disobedience to her royal will he had since committed. Surely, if Mary had desired to punish him for the trouble and distress he had caused her, she had the fullest opportunity, and excuse too, for securing his person on the present occasion; but her conduct witnesses for her that her desire was to her husband, and her object was conciliation, not revenge. Moray, when he subsequently brought forward a journal fabricated for the express purpose of misrepresenting the proceedings of his royal sister, shrewdly calculated that it would be circulated among thousands who could have no means of detecting its falsehoods by the evidence of the letter of the Privy Council, to which himself was a party. How, indeed, were people in general to know that such a letter was ever written? Addressed as it was to a foreign Princess, it remained a sealed secret till brought to light by the zealous research of the honest Protestant Bishop Keith, in the middle of the

last century.[1] It is also necessary to notice that Buchanan pretends that the Queen was residing at this period in the Exchequer House, for the purpose of having private interviews with the Earl of Bothwell, and that one night she sent Lady Reres over the garden wall to fetch Bothwell to her out of his own wife's bed, and goes so far as to affirm "that the Queen with her own hands let Lady Reres down by a rope for that purpose; but as she was an old woman and very fat, the rope broke, and she hurt herself severely"[2] —a tale too absurd for historical notice, were it not to prove how utterly unworthy of credit are the assertions of the author of a fiction so notoriously disgraceful to his pen. If the Queen had wished to see Bothwell, her doors would, as a matter of course, have been open to him at any hour it pleased her to appoint. The records of the Privy Council prove she was residing in Holyrood House at the time mentioned, engaged in the business of the Convention of her nobles, and so desirous of her husband's presence that she returned to Stirling in the hope of persuading him to accompany her back. This she would scarcely have done if intoxicated by a guilty passion for another; and if so lost to shame as her libeller pretends, scandal would have been busy on the subject, nor would Darnley have failed to tax her in self-defence with misconduct, when so earnestly pressed by Du Croc, as well as the Lords of the Council and herself, to declare what was the cause of his discontent.

"The Queen," says Du Croc, "made a beautiful speech, and prayed and persuaded him with all her power to declare, in the presence of every one, if there were any occasion she had given him, and she besought him with clasped hands not to spare her. And the Lords said,[3] 'they could see plainly, by the bad countenance with which he had received them, that they were the cause of his intending to go away,' and prayed him 'to let them know in what they

[1] The French copy of the same is printed in M. Teulet's Pièces et Documens relatifs des Affaires d'Escosses, vol. ii.

[2] Detection of Mary Stuart, by George Buchanan—Anderson's Collections.

[3] Letter to the Queen-mother of France—Prince Labanoff, vol. i. Also Teulet, vol. ii. p. 149.

had displeased him.' For my part," continues Du Croc, "I told him that his voyage would affect either the honour of the Queen or his own. If he went with just occasion, that would touch the Queen's; if without, it would not at all redound to his praise; and that I could not fail to give my testimony both as to what I had formerly seen, and did at present see. At last he declared that he had had no cause at all given him for such a resolution."[1]

The Privy-Councillors, who were eyewitnesses of this scene, record that "her Majesty was pleased to enter into the discourse, and spoke in the most affectionate manner possible to him, 'beseeching him that, as she could not prevail on him to open his heart to her *when they were in private together in the night*,[2] as she had earnestly endeavoured, that he would at least be pleased to declare before this company if there were anything in which she had offended him. She could assure him,' she said, 'with a clear conscience, that she had never in her life done anything that could prejudice either his honour or her own;' meekly adding 'that as she might perchance have displeased him inadvertently, and without intending it, she begged him to tell her without disguise what it was she had done, and she would endeavour to satisfy him.'" But not for anything either the Queen, Monsieur Du Croc, or the Lords could say, would he acknowledge what ailed him. In the end, however, he freely declared "the Queen had not given him any cause of complaint;"[3] yet he not only persisted in leaving her, but with manifest indications of ill-will, by taking his leave, without kissing her, in these cruel words, "Adieu, madam; you shall not see my face for a long time."[4] Lethington began to remonstrate with him in French; but he cut him short with the sarcastic rejoinder, "My Lord of Lethington, you speak French too finely for me." Then, after bidding Monsieur Du Croc farewell,

[1] Du Croc to the Archbishop of Glasgow, in Keith.
[2] Letter of the Privy Council—Teulet, vol. ii. Keith, 349.
[3] Letter of the Lords of the Council to the Queen-mother of France—Keith, 349. Ibid., from the French copy in M. Teulet's Pièces et Documens.
[4] Du Croc to Archbishop of Glasgow—Keith.

he turned himself to the Lords in general, and said, "Adieu, gentlemen," and so departed.[1]

Du Croc and the Lords of the Council remained with the Queen, and consoled her as well as they could, "praying her always to continue to be prudent and virtuous, and not to grieve or afflict herself, for the truth would very soon be made manifest"[2]—testimony in favour of Mary's moral worth and conjugal discretion which, considering the sources whence it is derived, ought surely to outweigh the calumnies of the self-interested accusers and hireling libellers of this unfortunate Princess.

The Lords fancied that Darnley had no intention of leaving Scotland, and suspected that it was all a trick of the Earl of Lennox, in order to give the Queen a false alarm; but if so, the petulance and sullen temper of the young man defeated its object, for Mary was evidently so afraid of losing him that he had the fairest opportunity possible of making his own terms with her for anything that might have been in her power to grant, as a condition of remaining with her. "He is not yet embarked," observes Du Croc; "but we receive advertisement from day to day that he still holds on his resolution, and keeps a ship in readiness. It is vain to imagine that he will be able to raise any disturbance, for there is not one person in all this kingdom, from the highest to the lowest, that regards him any farther than is agreeable to the Queen. And I never saw her Majesty so much beloved, esteemed, and honoured, nor so great harmony amongst her subjects, as at present is by her wise conduct."[3]

Darnley, equally unstable as obstinate, a few days after this scene requested Du Croc to meet him at a place between Edinburgh and Glasgow, where he was with his father, and intimated his desire that the Queen would send for him. Du Croc replied "that he did not doubt of the goodness of the Queen; but there were not many wives who would send in quest of him, after he had gone away,

[1] Italian Despatch, in Labanoff's Appendix.
[2] Du Croc to the Queen-mother of France.
[3] Letter to the Archbishop of Glasgow.

as he had himself declared, without any cause. There are but two things, as far as I can see," continues the venerable statesman, "that can have put him into this state of desperation. The first is, the reconciliation of the Lords with the Queen, because he is jealous that they hold her in higher esteem than himself; and as he is proud and haughty, he likes not for foreigners to perceive it. The other is, that he is assured that whoever shall come to represent the Queen of England at the baptism will not make any account of him, and he is apprehensive of receiving an open slight."[1] Darnley wrote, meantime, in a mystified style to the Queen, intimating that he was still meditating to leave Scotland. She was informed from other quarters, also, that he was making secret preparations for his departure. "According to all we have seen, and to the best of our knowledge," write the Lords of the Privy Council to her royal mother-in-law of France, "he has no ground of complaint, but, on the contrary, every reason to look upon himself as one of the most fortunate Princes in Christendom, could he but appreciate his own happiness, and know how to use the good fortune God has put into his hands."[2]

Little did Moray, Lethington, and their accomplices, when engaged, a few months later, in fabricating against their unfortunate Sovereign the blackest charges they could devise of her conduct to her husband, foresee that the testimony themselves have borne of her virtues should, in the fulness of time, afford a more convincing refutation of their calumnies than the ablest arguments that could be advanced by her warmest partisans in her justification. Though Darnley had obstinately refused to state his grievances by word of mouth, either in private to his royal consort, or in presence of the French ambassador and the Privy Council, he thought proper, a few days later, to write a letter to her, telling her "that he had two causes of complaint: first, that her Majesty trusted him not with so much authority, nor was at such pains to advance him, and make him be honoured by the nation, as she did at first; and, secondly, that no one

[1] Du Croc to the Queen-mother of France.
[2] Teulet's Pièces et Documens, vol. ii.

attended him, and the nobles avoided his company."[1] To this Mary answered, "that if the case were so, he had no one to blame but himself, for in the beginning she bestowed so much honour on him as proved the worse for herself, since the authority wherein she had placed him served as a shelter to those who so heinously offended her. Yet she nevertheless continued to treat him with the same respect; and although they who did perpetrate the murder of her faithful servant in her presence had entered her chamber with his knowledge, following close behind him, naming him as the head of their enterprise, yet would she never accuse him of it, but did always excuse him, and seemed as if she believed it not. As for his complaint that he is not well attended, it is his own fault; for she has always placed at his command such as receive her wages, the same as if they were his own. As for the nobles, they come to Court when it suits their own convenience or pleasure, and according to the good countenance they receive; but he has taken no pains to win them, having even forbidden those Lords to enter his chamber whom her Majesty first appointed to wait upon him. If, therefore, the nobility shun him, his deportment towards them is the cause. If he wishes them to follow him, he must, in the first place, endeavour to make them love him, by behaving amiably to them; otherwise her Majesty will find insuperable difficulties in arranging these points, and especially to induce them to accede to his having the management of affairs put into his hands, to which they have never agreed, nor does she find any of them disposed to consent to it prospectively."[2]

As the originals of these letters have not been discovered, the readers of Mary's biography must rest contented with the dry business-like abstracts of their contents derived from the recital of the Lords of the Privy Council, which are sufficient to establish the fact that no personal misconduct on the part of the Queen was alleged by her husband

[1] Letter of Mary's Privy Council to the Queen of France, in Keith and Teulet.

[2] Letter of the Lords of the Privy Council, French copy in M. Teulet, vol. ii. p. 146. Translation in Keith of copy from Scotch College.

as the cause of his discontent; neither is any objection to Bothwell, or complaints of his superior influence, made by him. There is, indeed, no other grounds than the fictions of Buchanan for the generally repeated assertion that Darnley was ever jealous of Bothwell, either politically or personally. All his anger, and all his unkindness to the Queen at this period, originated in his hostility to the leading members of the rival faction, Moray, Lethington, and Argyll, in whose tutelage she then was, and who were as much the foes of Bothwell as of himself.

"The Queen our Sovereign," writes Robert Melville, who happened to be on a visit to his own Court during this remarkable episode in Mary's wedded life, "was in some displeasure at my deportment upon evil behaviour of the King's part, who was of mind to depart out of the realm, and no occasion given him by her Majesty, as the whole Council can record; neither will he declare wherein his discontentment is, but in general, that he is not regarded with the nobility as he should be, neither can obtain such things as he seeks—to wit, such persons as the Secretary (*Lethington*), the Justice-Clerk (*Bellenden*), and Clerk of Register (*Makgill*), to be put out of their office, alleging they should be guilty of this last odious fact:"[1] meaning the assassination of Riccio and arrest of the Queen, the accomplices in which crimes, though implicated himself in the confederacy, Darnley never could be induced to tolerate. And his indignation at Mary's infatuation in allowing herself to be deluded, by Moray's perfidious protestations of their innocence, into pardoning and restoring them to the high and important offices of which he, her husband, had vainly demonstrated to her they were unworthy, transported him beyond the bounds of prudence in his deportment, not only to them, but to her, whom he perversely desired to afflict, because he knew it was in his power to do so. He blinded himself to the difficult position in which he had been the means of placing her, and desired her to act as if she had been a despotic Sovereign, by inflicting condign punishment on

[1] Keith, 351.

all who deserved it; to make no compromise between justice and expediency, but to devote to death, to life-long exile and forfeiture, every one of his late confederates — those who had beguiled him into consenting to Riccio's murder, and then flung the brand of Cain on him. How great was his abhorrence of their characters, how deep his remorse for the assassination of Riccio, may be inferred from the circumstance of his desiring to offer up to the manes of the victim a sacrifice so extensive!

Never did Mary commit so great a mistake as in preventing Darnley from visiting France. It would have been out of his power to do either her or himself the slightest harm there. Change of scene might have proved beneficial to himself, as he would probably have got much better advice from his uncle, the Lord of Aubigné, than he was accustomed to receive from his father, whose residence in Scotland had proved fatal to the peace of the young royal pair. But for the selfish ambition of Lennox, who desired to govern Scotland under the name of his intemperate, pleasure-loving, and indolent son, and therefore constantly incited him, in concert with the Douglas party, to demand the crown-matrimonial, Mary and Darnley might have lived on the happiest of terms. If Darnley, with all his faults, had not been very dear to the heart of his royal consort, she would have hailed the prospect of his departure with satisfaction, as he would have been far more out of her way than either at Dalkeith, Stirling, or Peebles, to which *remote* places Buchanan, with the usual inconsistency of false witness, pretends she in turn banished him, "that she might enjoy, first, the society of her deformed little Italian Secretary, and afterwards that of the one-eyed Earl Bothwell, unrestrained by his presence." If her desire of being rid of her handsome young husband were indeed so great, why did she not permit him to retire to France without opposition? It would have been easy enough for her to have had him murdered or imprisoned there, through her all-powerful kindred, if she had cherished those evil intentions against him of which her calumniators accuse her. Why, then, we repeat,

did she not let him go? Is there the female heart that has ever felt the power of a constant and enduring love—a love which neither time nor injuries can alienate—that does not mentally reply, "Because she was a faithful wife, and a fond, weak woman, whose realm would have been to her as a desert in the absence of the object of her yearning affection, unworthy though he were of her regard?"

END OF VOL. IV.

PRINTED BY WILLIAM BLACKWOOD AND SONS, EDINBURGH.

00141898

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 28 March, 2016